
THE
UNIVERSITY
OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE EFFECTS OF THE REFORMATION ON IDEALS OF LIFE AND CONDUCT

The Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct

Hulsean Prize Essay of
Cambridge University
for 1925

BY

REV. F. K. CHAPLIN, M.A.
(Cantab.)

Formerly Burney Prizeman and
Burney Research Student of
Cambridge University

W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.
CAMBRIDGE MCMXXVII.

BV630
.C5



PRINTED IN ENGLAND

808643

Foreword.

"THERE was never anything by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted";[1] mankind, moreover, grows out of his swaddling-clothes. Thus the Church which was with Moses in the Wilderness,[2] (the descendants of Abraham, the first Father of the Universal Church),[3] proved unable to accommodate itself to changing circumstances, and was rejected. From the Jewish Church sprang the Christian religion. Christianity began, in a sense, by an act of schism; and its history might well be called L'Histoire des variations des Eglises protestantes.

There were, of course, the various kinds of Gnostics, the Arians and Nestorians, and what not. The Roman Church, founded probably by Greek Christians, certainly drawing its life from Greek Scriptures and Greek-speaking missionaries,—the word Pope itself is Greek in origin,—cut itself off in 1054 from the original Christian Church, and thus may be said to have brought about a Reformation.

In the visible Church the evil is ever "mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments."[4] So it was with the Papacy. The

[1] Preface to The Book of Common Prayer.
[2] Acts, vii. 38.
[3] Dean Stanley, p. 7, *Lectures on the Eastern Church* (Dent).
[4] *Articles of Religion*, Art. XXVI.

Church of the West in the Middle Ages was a magnificent organisation; but in process of time it erred, not only in its living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.[1] Under the domination of the Papacy, Church and State, Religion and Morality were inextricably interwoven. In the sixteenth century, however, the Reformers made prominent the principles that holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,[2] and the "most wholesome doctrine" that "we are justified by Faith only."[3]

Then arose a new conception of Religion. The visible Church of Christ came to be thought of as "a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered."[1] At the same time political thinkers were presenting the theory that the State was an imperium, which could be independent of the Pope. So Religion became possible apart from the Church, and the State became independent of the Church: but Religion remained under the control of the State. It was the age of Erastianism.

The consequences of this we are about to trace in considering The Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct.

[1] *Articles of Religion*, Art. XIX.
[2] Ibid., Art. VI.
[3] Ibid., Art. XI.

Contents.

		PAGE
	FOREWORD	v
I	SEPARATION OF CHURCH FROM STATE	3
II	SEPARATION OF RELIGION FROM THE CHURCH	49
III	SEPARATION OF STATE FROM CHURCH	87
IV	SEPARATION OF MORALITY FROM RELIGION	133
	CONCLUSION	155
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	158
	INDEX	163

I
The Roman Catholic Church

I

Separation of Church from State.

JUSTIFICATION by Faith was the basis of Luther's argument, the motive of his separation, the root and principle of his religion.[1] It was a lever of wonderful strength.[2] So much so that Döllinger contracted his history of the Reformation into a history of Justification; recognising in this the cause of all that followed.[1] Anyone who becomes absorbed in Luther's conception of Faith will find it difficult to believe that Luther merely supplemented the old dogma by adding one or two doctrines. He will be inclined rather to trust the Roman Catholic judgment according to which Luther overthrew the teaching of the Church, and retained only some portions of the ruins.[3]

Luther, in fact, restored nothing less than the religious way of understanding the Gospel.[4] He rediscovered in the Gospel the knowledge of God: and linked together surrender to God and surrender to Christ.[5]

The doctrine of Justification by Faith was in harmony with the spirit of the age. Everywhere, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, we discern a secret, propelling force, difficult to describe in a word, but which was an eager endeavour to live and act and work as one's self. It was a protest against

[1] Acton, p. 396.
[2] Döllinger, p. 26.
[3] Harnack, p. 193.
[4] Ibid., p. 172.
[5] Ibid., p. 183, note 5.

the spirit of the centuries; the beginning of a new attitude towards Life: a wish to be free.[1] One of the most notable elements in the Renaissance was this desire for the development of individuality.

For two generations the active life had been insisting upon its rights. Men wanted personal religion, an intimate relationship with God. So it was with Luther. Inward unrest, anxiety about Salvation, drove him into the convent, in order that he might, in a genuinely Catholic way, through multiplied good works, propitiate the strict Judge, and get for himself a gracious God.[2]

While, however, he employed all the means offered him by the mediaeval Church, his temptations and miseries grew. He seemed to be contending with all the powers of darkness. When even a small temptation came, he found that neither baptism nor "monkery" was of any help. He had now "long lost Christ, and His baptism, and was the most miserable man on earth"; for what he knew of Christ "was nothing more than that He was a stern Judge," from whom it was impossible to escape.[3]

In the sacraments and other religious observances he failed to find the assurance of peace for which he sought; until gradually there was disclosed to him, especially while reading the Epistle to the Romans, the truth and power of the Gospel. At last the Christian religion became for Luther a vivid assurance of the living God, who has revealed Himself, and opened His heart, in Christ. Then rising above

[1] Harnack, p. 18 and *passim*.
[2] Ibid., p. 181.
[3] Ibid., p. 181 and note 3. See also Creighton, Vol. VI, pp. 62, 63.

all anxieties and terrors, above all ascetic devices, above all instruction of theology, above all interference of priest and sacraments, he ventured to lay hold of God Himself in Christ. In this act of Faith he came to know the power which gives steadfastness and peace. He knew it, and called it by its name, "Faith," the personal and continuous surrender to God which transforms and renews the whole man, a living, busy, active thing, a sure confidence which makes a man joyous and happy, ever ready to serve everyone and to suffer all things.[1]

The Reformation was primarily a moral reformation.[2] It is Luther's monument, for it all sprang from the intense personal conviction and contagious faith of one man.[3] On the other hand, the movement was deeply rooted in the needs of the age. "Had no Luther arisen, Germany would not have remained Catholic."[4] As it was, "under the influence of men of the grave and earnest Teutonic race the life of the Renaissance was infused into religion";[5] and took possession of all the nations of the West in turn.[4]

The deep-rooted corruption of the Church is fully admitted by both sides.[4] The reform of the clergy was an urgent necessity; and had been attempted by several Councils;[6] but no Pope cared to risk a generous scheme of reform. The clergy as a body

[1] Harnack, p. 181, *passim*.
[2] Ibid., p. 192, note 1.
[3] Beard, p. 81.
[4] Döllinger, pp. 61–64. Grisar, Vol. VI.
[5] Beard, p. 2.
[6] *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, p. 29.

were perhaps not so bad as they have been painted; but grave charges of ignorance, indifference, concubinage, and simony were not wholly groundless.[1] It is safe to say that, with the exception of the Carthusians, all the older orders required reform.[2] Even the Popes could not deny that Rome itself was the seat and source of corruption, and the Popes its authors and disseminators.[3] The failure of the Fifth Lateran Council sent a thrill of dismay through the Christian world and opened the way for Luther.[1]

Erasmus, even, brings "many grave accusations"[4] against both priests and monks. He speaks of them devoting themselves to gluttony.[5] They shift their lodgings whenever they are attracted by a more dainty kitchen and complain because I have not been drinking with them for five or six years,—like sponges, which have only to soak,—and have not been following loose pleasures, nor playing at dice, nor acting the part of sycophants. Mendicity being their profession they subsist on money scraped together from widows.[6]

As for the Roman See, Erasmus says that complaints were common, even from good men, of its tyranny, rapacity, and other vices. He speaks also of "bare-faced traffic" in Indulgences.[7] For many years, no doubt, he adds, the chief evils of the world have come from Rome. The shamelessness of the

[1] MacCaffrey, p. 52.
[2] Grisar, p. 56. *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, p. 148.
[3] Döllinger, pp. 61–64. Grisar, Vol. VI.
[4] Gasquet, pp. 200 and 202.
[5] To C. Eschenveld, October 19th, 1518. Janssen, p. 575.
[6] To M. Laurinus, April 5th, 1518. To John of Louvain, January 2nd, 1518.
[7] Gasquet, p. 202.

Roman Courts, he writes in 1518, has reached its climax.[1] The Curia is incapable of a blush, for what can be more shameless than this constant supply of Pardons?[2]

It was over this question of Pardons and Indulgences that the revolt against the corruption of the Church came to a head.[3] Leo X wanted money to complete the building of St. Peter's, and accordingly sent abroad emissaries authorised to grant Indulgences for all sins, and "reconciliation with the most High," to all the faithful who would subscribe. Such a proceeding was no novelty. The first instance of Indulgences being applied to souls in purgatory occurred in 1476 under Pope Sixtus IV. The success of the innovation aroused dreams of avarice which hardened into one of the worst scandals in Christian history.[4]

It is evident that the common people did generally believe that these Indulgences removed the *guilt* of sin. The fact is acknowledged by Councils. They blamed the Pardon-sellers.[5] On this occasion the proceedings resembled a "public trafficking,"[6] and aroused an outburst of moral indignation which began the Reformation.[7] The popular support which grew in intensity as Luther advanced is one of the most significant features of the movement.[8]

[1] To Bishop Fisher, March 5th, 1518.
[2] To Colet, March, 1518. MacCaffrey, pp. 38–40.
[3] Seignobos (Mediaeval), p. 285.
[4] Pullan, pp. 10, 11.
[5] Lindsay, p. 226. Robertson, p. 406, says that the resentment was mostly because Indulgences were draining Germany of money.
[6] Seignobos (Mediaeval), p. 285.
[7] *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, p. 113.
[8] Lea (*Indul.*), Vol. III, pp. 396, 397.

Priests were foremost in the agitation, not for Luther's sake, but in order that they might vomit further their long-felt hatred of Rome.[1] Nuncios and Legates continually reported that without reform all plans for suppressing heresy would be in vain; because Catholics and Lutherans, clergy and laity, were united in a hostility to Rome which could be placated only by sweeping away the abuses.[2] Neither Luther nor Zwingli attacked the *system* of Indulgences, at first. What they opposed was the use of Indulgences as a means of raising money. If not in intention, yet in effect, Tetzel taught that the pardon obtained by the precious blood of Christ could be purchased for souls in purgatory by a piece of money and a paper certificate.[3]

It is sometimes asserted that Tetzel taught a remission of the temporal punishment, not of the guilt, of sin. There must also be conversion, change of heart, and a good confession. This is pure assertion. Grisar himself admits[4] that Tetzel was not exactly an example of virtue, and that he employed repulsive phrases in extolling his wares. He used wrong, exaggerated, and unauthorised statements about the application of Indulgences to the Departed.[4] In the moral corruption of the Church the idea had arisen that pious works laid the foundation of merit, apart from the disposition of the doer. They could even be done for us by others,—on payment. Pardons might be bought.[5]

The fact is that "there were many discreditable

[1] Lea, p. 405.
[2] Ibid., p. 410.
[3] Pullan, p. 1.
[4] Grisar, p. 329.
[5] K. Von Hase, p. 3.

particulars in connection with these Indulgences."[1] Erasmus saw clearly how unwise it would be to disturb things, i.e. Papal Pardons, etc., from which a rich harvest was reaped by priests and monks. Consequently it is not surprising that Martin Luther discovered poor souls believing that when they had purchased such letters they had secured their salvation: that the moment the money tinkled in the box souls were delivered from purgatory; thus being led, as Luther put it, "in the paths of death." In addition, Luther informs the Archbishop, it has gone abroad under your name (i.e. in a little book of instructions); but doubtless without your knowledge, that this Indulgence is the priceless gift of God whereby the many may be reconciled to God and escape the fires of purgatory; so that those who purchase the Indulgences have no need of repentance.[2]

One of the first effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct was the stopping of this "traffic" in Indulgences. Officially the scandal was not stopped until the time of the Council of Trent. Actually the thing ceased in 1517. That is to say, the *abuses* were admitted, and their removal strongly insisted upon. With regard to the system itself, however, there was no yielding, not an inch.[3] The Holy See had no intention of foregoing the profit to be obtained.[4] On the contrary, there has been a noble strife between people and Papacy as to who should be foremost, the latter in granting, the former

[1] Grisar, p. 329. Creighton, Vol. VI, p. 66.
[2] Luther to the Abp. of Mayence, October 31st, 1517.
[3] Harnack, pp. 54, 55.
[4] H. C. Lea, p. 410.

in gaining Indulgences.[1] The tiresome injunction about moderation laid down by the Council of Trent has been contemptuously disregarded.[2]

Still, the scandalous abuse of the system ceased. The control of the keys was so remunerative that people had been permitted to barter for cash impunity both on earth and in heaven.[2] Religion, in the minds of the ordinary people meant that the keys of the other world were held by the clergy. If a man confessed regularly, received the Sacrament, and Absolution, then all was well with him. His duties consisted in going to Confession and Mass. If he sinned, penances were prescribed which could be commuted. Nor was death the limit of extortion: death was rather the gate of the province which the clergy had made peculiarly their own. When a man died he was in purgatory—Purgatory Pickpurse our English Latimer called it—and a priest if properly paid could get him out.[3] When, however, the force of the Reformation was recognised, the Church abandoned that which most weighed it down: it renounced pecuniary profit.[2] The Reformation was most fortunate for both clergy and people; for the demoralisation unless checked would have made the Church an influence for "unmixed evil."[4] As it is, the Roman Church has entered upon a new phase of wide influence and prosperity.

This is one of the Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct which has been felt by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants; but in countries where the Papacy was repudiated the

[1] Fr. Lepicier. "Indulgences." Quoted by Lea, p. 528.
[2] Lea, p. 528. [3] Froude, pp. 53, 54. [4] Lea, p. 584.

effect has been greater still. In the Roman Church the object appears to be, in practice, to release the sinner from the consequences of sin, rather than to make him abstain from sinning. Among the educated there must be many who appreciate the need for repentance; but the general tendency is towards a sort of magic formula. The retort is often a *tu quoque*. Protestants are just as bad, for they offer Heaven for Faith, without mentioning penance or good works. In practice, this may often seem on the surface to be true; but it must be remembered that the Protestant has to deal direct with God. This is among the important Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct which follow immediately and inevitably when Justification by Faith is made prominent; for with Luther, at at least in his better moments, Faith was a spiritual incorporation of the soul with its Saviour involving a renewed and strengthened nature. Christianity became once more a personal thing, a power within the soul, placing it in direct relation to God.[1] In its earliest, deepest, spiritual form, Justification by Faith is mystical. It brings the soul into immediate contact with its Divine Object, and expects from that contact all the fruits of the religious life.[2] Luther taught that the penitence which is required by Christ is an habitual thing which lasts continuously for life.[3] When the greatest value was set on ritual—when the inner pains of repentance were hidden behind penance—when benefactions to the Church were accepted in atonement for

[1] Beard, pp. 130 and 133. [3] *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, pp. 127. 128.
[2] Ibid., p. 204.

flagrant sin, and escape from purgatory could be bought from wandering Indulgence-mongers in any market place—it was a great thing to recall men's minds to the fact that religion is a frame of mind from which alone can spring actions acceptable to God.[1]

If any evidence is required that this was what Luther meant by Faith, or that Justification was at the bottom of his opposition to Tetzel, a glance at Martin Luther's correspondence will be sufficient. About the time of Tetzel's coming to Germany Luther had been comparing the portions of Scriptures which treated of Repentance, the words with that meaning crowding upon him from all directions, so that this which up till then had been to him the bitterest word in the Bible sounded dearer and sweeter than any other.[2] He appears to have discovered that the Greek for repentance meant a change of disposition; so that it was not concerned primarily with "Works," but meant a change of sentiment. Already, in 1516, Luther is writing that at present the temptation to rest on one's own works is very powerful; but one cannot appear before God, adorned with every grace by trying to do good. If we may obtain peace of conscience by our own efforts, why did Christ die?[3]

Luther had not then made up his mind about Indulgences. As late as 1518 he regarded the matter as doubtful, but considered present-day Indulgences "a deceiver of souls," and of no use,

[1] Beard, pp. 129, 130.

[2] Luther to J. von Steupitz, May 30th, 1518. See also Lindsay, Vol. I, p. 435.

[3] Luther to G. Spenlein, April 7th, 1516.

except as an encouragement to lazy Christians.[1] At the basis of the system there was, he thought, the great truth that it was the business of the Church to declare the free and sovereign grace of God.[2] Not until later did he realise that the whole business was "only a deception, through which faith in God was destroyed."[3]

Luther's attempts, however, to criticise Tetzel's proceedings aroused the opposition of all concerned in the traffic. In fact, it very soon appeared that the whole question of Papal authority had been raised. Luther was required to submit without argument. At first he was, to some extent, inclined to obey,[4] to do nothing more in the affair, but let it, so to speak, bleed to death.[4]

Recant, on the other hand, he could not. His writings had become far too widely known, and had taken root in too many hearts. The German nation, then in the bloom of its intellectual awakening, understood the controversy so thoroughly that even the appearance of a recantation would have brought the Roman Church into still worse repute, and made everyone speak against it.[4]

Nevertheless he had been embroiled in the dispute for three years before he made the appeal "from his Holiness's judgment to a General Council."[5] The last straw was the wickedness of the Papal Court, "which even thyself cannot deny has been

[1] Luther to G. Stalatin, February 15th, 1518.
[2] *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, p. 121.
[3] Luther to H. Tulich, 1520.
[4] Luther to the Elector, January, 1519, and March 13th; but see Luther to C. Scheurl, February 20th, 1519. See also Creighton, Vol. VI, p. 61.
[5] Luther to Pope Leo X, October 13th, 1520.

a very Sodom, Gomorrah, and Babylon." Once it had been the gate of Heaven; now it was the very jaws of Hell. "That is why I attack it so mercilessly, most Holy Leo." Luther could not submit his conscience to a Pope "in whose heart Christ does not reign."[1]

The Reformation was a moral reformation.[2] Luther might have acknowledged the authority of a Curia which possessed any moral superiority, but after three years of controversy he was convinced that the Papacy was "the personification of Antichrist's throne," and that he was justified in resisting its deceptions and wiles for the sake of the salvation of souls.[3] It is at least a part of the truth to say that the Reformers separated from Rome because of the moral corruption of the Papacy.[4] "If I can get fire," declared Luther, "I will publicly burn the whole Papal Code, and make an end of the humility I have hitherto displayed."[5]

One of the Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct was a transformation of the ideal, not only of religious, but of *moral* perfection. According to Harnack,[6] this was first successfully demonstrated by Ritschl. It appears to be true in spite of the fact that it was only on the religious side that Luther firmly established his ideal of a Christian life,[7] and that in Germany his followers

[1] Luther to Pope Leo X, October 13th, 1520.
[2] See below, p. 87. See also Lindsay, Vol. I, pp. 442–444.
[3] Luther to J. Lange, August 18th, 1520.
[4] *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, p. 148.
[5] Luther to G. Spalatin, July 10th, 1520.
[6] Harnack, p. 192, note 1.
[7] Ibid., p. 192.

did not at first display that moral superiority which might have been expected; so that Erasmus was able to declare, "Lutherans I see, but followers of the Gospel I discover few or none."[1] "Show me a man whom that gospel has changed from a toper to a temperate man, from a miser into a liberal person, from a shameless to a chaste being; and I will show you many who have become even worse than they were. Now that they have thrown the images out of the churches and abolished Mass, has anything come instead?"[2]

There is, in fact, good reason to believe that the Reformation was accompanied and followed by Antinomianism and degeneracy of public morals. Döllinger's three volumes on the Reformation is a collection of evidence to this effect. Luther and Melanchthon often complained bitterly of the abuse of the liberty of the Gospel.[3] In passage after passage Luther declares that vice of every kind had increased:[4] nor does he altogether exculpate the doctrine of Justification,—or its misapprehension. The most vital interests of the new work were endangered by the low moral standard of so many of its advocates. The frivolous element among the clergy and "religious,"—indeed all who longed for a life of freedom,—were attracted to the new movement.[5] Luther's book on Monastic Vows taught that vows of chastity should be neglected. As a result many monks and nuns sought the pleasures

[1] Erasmus (Froude's trans.), epistles 478 and 501.
[2] Erasmus to B. Rhenanus 1530.
[3] Grisar, Vol. II, p. 22.
[4] Beard, p. 145.
[5] Grisar, Vol. II, pp. 115, 116. See also Acton, p. 146.

denied them hitherto.[1] There were Roman Catholic contemporaries who pointed out that the going over to Protestantism of many whose lives did not correspond with the demands of the Church had a wholesome effect, particularly in the monasteries where a revival of discipline became possible after those who had entered the religious life from a worldly motive had gone. God had purged His floor and separated the chaff from the wheat.[2]

We are not at liberty to ignore the fact that the Roman Catholics could not at that time point to any shining examples on their side who might have shamed their opponents.[3] The degeneracy had begun before the Reformation. Celibacy was a foul fountain of unchastity and uncleanness. Monastic establishments were objects of contempt and ridicule.[4] On the other hand, one must not lay all the blame upon "the loose morality that resulted from the revival of pagan ideas,"[5] or "the low moral tone of the age."[6] After making the fullest allowance for the "flagrant irreligion of France and Italy,"[7] and for the younger "Religious" who were unable to control themselves,[8] there is still the fact that Luther himself does not altogether exculpate the doctrine of Justification. Sometimes his own language may well have been responsible. In his Table Talk he recommends getting rid of thoughts of terror and sadness by means such as calling up images of a pretty girl or of drink. There is the famous Pecca

[1] Grisar, Vol. II, pp. 78 and 82.
[2] Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 426.
[3] Schaffe, p. 127.
[4] Janssen, Vol. I, pp.
[5] P. Gardner, p. 25, and Gasquet, p. 33.
[6] MacCaffrey, p. 11.
[7] Ibid., p. 17.
[8] Grisar, Vol. II, p. 118.

Fortiter passage.[1] Esto peccator et pecca fortiter; sed fortius fide. One must, however, remember the context, "Sin shall not drag us away from Him even should we commit fornication or murder thousands and thousands of times a day." Do you think that the price and the ransom paid for our sins by this sublime Lamb is so insignificant?

The subject of Luther's relation to Antinomianism is discussed by Hartmann von Grisar at length. He says that Luther taught the "strangely unethical assertion" that good works performed without faith amounted to sin, that even though the believer commits sin he remains a godly man,[2] but the damned are pre-destined to Hell and cannot escape in spite of their best efforts.[3]

Hence it is not surprising that some would make him out an Antinomian,—but wrongly.[4] Nevertheless the movement "sprang from the seed he scattered."[5] As a matter of fact, Luther not only proclaimed war on Antinomians, but even spoke of excommunicating such men.[6] As for what "sprang from the seed he scattered." According to Grisar people were led to relinquish an unequal struggle with sin: to blame human frailty, an ineradicable concupiscence, or to blame the Almighty Devil: or to blame their lack of freedom, or, going to the other extreme, to display an artificial confidence. It may be. Judging from certain expressions of the

[1] Luther to Melancthon, August 1st, 1521.
[2] Grisar, Vol. V, p. 47.
[3] Ibid., p. 4.
[4] Ibid., p. 10.
[5] Ibid., p. 15.
[6] Ibid., pp. 15 and 19. Luther to F. Burkhardt, January 7th, 1538, and to Agric., January 6th, 1528.

Reformers themselves, it was so. Personally, I cannot help feeling that many professed Antinomianism because it provided a cloak for licentiousness. It is important, as Macaulay pointed out,[1] to distinguish between the logical and the practical consequences of an opinion. The doctrine of Predestination, in the opinion of many people, tends to make those who hold it utterly immoral. And certainly it would seem that a man who believes his eternal destiny to be already irrevocably fixed is likely to indulge his passions without restraint and to neglect his religious duties. If he is an heir of wrath, his exertions must be unavailing. If he is preordained to life, they must be superfluous. But would it be wise to punish every man who holds the higher doctrines of Calvinism, as if he had actually committed all those crimes which we know some Antinomians to have committed? Assuredly not. The fact notoriously is that there are many Calvinists as moral in their conduct as any Arminian, and many Arminians as loose as any Calvinist.

Anyhow, it is unfair to say that "Luther evolved a better system of ethics than his theories would lead us to expect."[2] Far better to say that he "wielded a wholesome rod," as was admitted in 1520 even by a Papal legate.[3] His occasional unguarded utterances must be taken in conjunction with his whole character and teaching.[4] The degeneracy, moreover, was only temporary, and was confined to Germany. There was no complaint from France, Holland, England, Scotland, New England, or indeed of the

[1] *Civil Disabilities of Jews.*
[2] Grisar, Vol. V, p. 5.
[3] Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 430.
[4] Schaffe, p. 22.

Puritan in general. The age was very corrupt, and it is perhaps not surprising that the Reformation did not at first reveal much cleansing force. The reformers had to deal with an immoral generation and left it little better than they found it.[1] Although they revolted against asceticism, and did much to restore family-life to its position in the Church, they failed to build up a religious view of the relations of the sexes.[2]

Yet there is the other side. England in particular, as Matthew Arnold has well said, was thrust into the dungeon of Puritanism and had the key turned on them for two hundred years.[3] Even quite recently people are said to have lived in such a prison. Mr. J. B. Crozier, referring to Calvinistic theology, recalls the Sabbath under which I in my boyhood groaned, with its solitude and gloom, its melancholy Psalms and its enforced renunciation of warmth, comfort, and even food; the belief in Predestination and Hell-fire over which for my godlessness and sins I was shaken nightly.[4] A large number of people became so interested in Predestination, that they did to a very great extent transform the whole of social life so far as they could; introducing a new atmosphere and a new spirit, and putting upon themselves all kinds of very real and very rigid limitations. The people did feel the bonds as bonds. People like Dickens or Hood always talk as if the home and the family traditions of their early days were puritanical to the most gloomy degree.

[1] Beard, p. 146. Schaffe, p. 24.
[2] Troëltsch, p. 199.
[3] Gardner, p. 26.
[4] Crozier, p. 21.

Their religious liberty, according to Mr. G. K. Chesterton,[1] created their social slavery. The restricting tendency was a direct, immediate effect of breaking loose and thinking for yourself. As is well-known, Mr. G. G. Coulton suggested, in opposition to this, that there was not a single point in seventeenth century Puritanism which was not orthodox in the Middle Ages. He chose to give battle on the attitude of orthodox mediaeval churchmen towards dancing. He produced enough evidence to show—what surely very few people ever doubted—that the mediaeval Church approved of asceticism. In those days, as to-day, many ecclesiastics considered dancing to be at least "doubtful." Mr. Chesterton was eager to show that Europe in the Middle Ages was just as addicted to "dance and Provencal song" as he himself is to-day. He certainly succeeded in reminding us that the majority of Roman Catholics before the Reformation were not ascetic. The controversy became somewhat involved; but this appeared to be the gist of the argument.

Eventually Mr. Chesterton came down to the contention that mediaeval religion, including mediaeval asceticism, was totally different from puritanism, was indeed contrary to puritanism, and was certainly much less gloomy. He did not explain the difference except by telling us that the two are as different as a Catholic and an "atheist vegetarian" when they both refuse meat on Friday.[2]

He then turned to literature. Men like Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, he says, speak of Puritanism

[1] G.K.C., p. 9. [2] Ibid., p. 32.

as a new thing. Shakespeare's characters, who accept a friar as something familiar and friendly, will talk of Malvolio being a puritan as if it were a sort of monster. This sort of thing has a certain plausibility. Otherwise it might well be ignored. The passage referred to must be this:[1]

SIR TOBY. Possess us, possess us; tell us something of him.

MARIA. Marry, Sir, sometimes he is a kind of puritan.

SIR ANDREW. O, if I thought that, I'd beat him like a dog.

SIR TOBY. What, for being a puritan? Thy exquisite reason, dear knight?

SIR ANDREW. I have no exquisite reason for it; but I have reason good enough.

MARIA. The devil a puritan that he is, or anything constantly, but a time-pleaser.

Part of the taunt is that, although Malvolio is *sometimes* a kind of puritan, he is nothing constantly —but a time-pleaser. No one, moreover, can fail to see that it is not the puritans who are being ridiculed; but the characters in whose mouths the word is placed. When Sir Andrew, who very rarely says anything intelligent, hears that Malvolio is a kind of puritan, he gives vent to a characteristic remark. "O! If I thought that, I'd beat him like a dog." Even Sir Toby cannot let this pass. "What, for being a puritan? Thy exquisite reason, dear knight." As usual the empty-headed Sir Andrew answers foolishly. "I have no exquisite reason for it; but I have reason good enough."[2]

[1] *Twelfth Night*, II, 3, 11, 150–160. [2] See p. 69.

Puritanism was a logical attempt to realise certain mediaeval ideals.[1] It is a feature of most religious revivals. The faults are due to exaggeration; e.g., an exaggerated belief in the value of deportment and of religious phrases, and an exaggerated depreciation of "the world"; in that sense which was hoary with antiquity before the sixteenth century.[1]

It seemed necessary, in passing, to glance at these points, because to-day there is a tendency to belittle the Effects of the Reformation on the Ideals of Life and Conduct.[2] We can now return to our statement that the Reformation was, among other things, a moral reformation. It is indisputable that the Catholic Church, in order to emphasise her opposition to so-called evangelical freedom, devoted herself ever more assiduously to a true inward life of religion.[3] While the mighty work of Luther was proceeding in the north of Europe, a revolution of a very different kind had taken place in the south. The temper of Italy and Spain was widely different from that of England and Germany. The religious Italians desired a reform of morals and discipline, but not of doctrine, and least of all a schism. The attachment of the Castilian to the faith of his ancestors was peculiarly strong and ardent. The effect of the great outbreak of Protestantism in one part of Christendon was to produce an equally violent outbreak of Catholic zeal in another. Two reformations were pushed on at once with equal energy and effect, a reformation of doctrine in the north, a reformation of manners and discipline in the south.

[1] Coulton, p. 11. Also Janssen, p. 569. [2] See p. 69.
[3] Grisar, Vol. VI, p. 430.

In the course of a single generation the whole spirit of the Church of Rome underwent a change. From the halls of the Vatican to the most secluded hermitage of the Apennines the great revival was everywhere felt and seen. The order of Jesuits began to exist, and grew rapidly to the full measure of its gigantic powers. That order possessed itself at once of all the strongholds which command the public mind, of the pulpit, of the press, of the confessional, of the academies. Literature and science, lately associated with infidelity or with heresy, now became the allies of orthodoxy.

The spirit which appeared so eminently in this order animated the whole Catholic world. The Court of Rome itself was purified. When the great stirring of the mind of Europe began, when nation after nation withdrew from communion with the successor of St. Peter, it was felt that the Church could not be safely confided to chiefs whose highest praise was that they were good judges of Latin compositions, of paintings, and of statues, whose severest studies had a pagan character, and who were suspected of laughing in secret at the sacraments which they administered, and of believing no more of the Gospel than of the Morgante Maggiore. Men of a very different class now rose to the direction of ecclesiastical affairs, men whose spirit resembled that of Dunstan and of Becket. Pius V under his gorgeous vestments wore day and night the hair shirt of a simple friar, walked bare-foot in the streets at the head of processions, found, even in the midst of his most pressing avocation, time for private prayer, often regretted that the public duties of his

station were unfavourable to growth in holiness, and edified his flock by innumerable instances of humility, charity and forgiveness of personal injuries. Gregory XIII exerted himself, not only to imitate, but to surpass Pius in the severe virtues of his sacred profession. As was the head, such were the members. The change in the spirit of the Catholic world may be traced in every walk of literature and of art. It will be at once perceived by every person who compares the poem of Tasso with that of Aristo, or the monuments of Sixtus V with those of Leo X.[1]

On the other hand, Roman Catholic writers would like to have it the other way, and say that letters, art, architecture, painting, and music, under the patronage of the Church had made great and steady progress before the advent of the new ideas.[2] Luther is represented as having declared that anyone reading the Chronicles will find that since the birth of Christ there is nothing that can compare with what has happened in our world during the last hundred years. Never in any country have people seen such building, so much cultivation of the soil. Never has such good drink, such abundant and delicate food, been within the reach of so many. More than all, we have men so capable and so learned that their wit penetrates everything, in such a way that nowadays a youth of twenty knows more than twenty doctors did in days gone by.[3]

On the strength of evidence that during the fifteenth century the building and beautifying of God's house was not left to noble benefactors, but

[1] Macaulay. [2] Gasquet, p. 13. [3] Ibid., p. 8.

that the people themselves initiated the work, adorning the walls of the churches with paintings and frescoes, filling in the tracery of the windows with pictured glass, carving, painting, decorating, making screens and altars: that the people loved to beautify their churches, for the Church was the centre of their lives as well as of their religion: Roman Catholic writers are eager to show that it was not the Reformation which brought to the world the blessings of education and the arts of civilisation. "What it did for these is plainly written in the history of that period of change and destruction."[1] "It neutralised the movement towards humanistic enlightenment that was being spread throughout Europe by men like Erasmus."[2]

It is certainly true that Erasmus often complained that wherever Lutheranism was dominant the study of letters was extinguished, but he does not blame the great reformers. On the contrary, he speaks of Luther and Melanchthon being compelled to call back the people to love of letters. Moreover, what he now says about the evangelical party, he had formerly said on many occasions against the advocates of conservatism.[3] Nevertheless, Erasmus wished that the Lutheran movement would end, for it had brought the humanists into bad odour.[4]

All this may be admitted, but it is perhaps going too far to say that his fears of Lutheranism being the

[1] Gasquet, p. 13.
[2] Wickham Steed, *Rev. of Rev.*, April, 1925.
[3] Huizinga, p. 236.
[4] Erasmus, Opera, ed. Le Clerc, Epis. 583.

death of solid scholarship were literally fulfilled. The case for this point of view is elaborated in Gasquet's *Eve of the Reformation*[1]; but the facts must not be taken apart from other considerations. To begin with, Erasmus was continually complaining of the ignorance and obscurantism of the clergy.[2] Then, again, although the spread of the new religion was at first followed by a decline in education, the decline was by no means confined to those regions which were torn away from the old faith.[3] Protestants were the first to recover, partly through Luther's vigorous appeals, and partly through the work of Melanchthon, who was called Praeceptor Germaniae.[3] In fact Catholics were exhorted to learn from their opponents; for owing to the sad conditions of the times they themselves had fallen astern.[3] Indeed there soon came a time when Catholics were angered by the sight of these flourishing schools becoming hotbeds of the new faith.[3]

The Dissolution of Religious Houses in England caused the destruction of an "incredibly enormous" number of books.[4] It also meant the destruction of "homes of study." The effect upon the education of children must have been considerable. The records of the universities afford evidence of the decay of learning. Fuller reports that the number of students had fallen off, and traces the cause directly to the fall of the religious houses. One in nine graduates had been "religious." At the fall of the

[1] Ch. 2.

[2] Erasmus, September 9th, 1520: to John of Louvain, January 2nd, 1518: to Cardinal Wolsey, May 18th, 1517, etc.

[3] Grisar, Vol. VI, p. 435.

[4] R. H. Benson, *Cam. His.*, Vol. III, p. 48.

abbeys fell the hearts of all the scholars, fearing the ruin of learning, and "these their jealousies they humbly represented in a bemoaning letter to King Henry VIII."[1] There were other causes which contributed to the decline of scholarship.[1] The current unrest was inimical to study. Even, however, if things were as bad as some would have us believe, it may be confidently stated that the breaking up of the old ground and the planting of it with new roots brought with it at least as much gain as loss.[2] Against the new movements of the human mind the religious houses almost inevitably were the most formidable obstacle; since they fostered and protected a method of thought of which the world was growing weary. The monastic ideal was one of pruning the tree to the loss of luxuriance. The new ideal was that of more generous cultivation of the whole of human nature. In the place of tradition rose up enterprise; and the rich development was furthered by the movement in which the fall of the religious houses was a notable incident, a necessary prelude to greater wideness of thought. They were obstacles, and they were removed.[3]

In estimating the Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct in this direction, it is impossible accurately to calculate gains and losses. The losses were concrete, verifiable. The gains were subtle, far-reaching, immature. The injury to education, at the time, the loss of books, antiquities, and traditions were lamentable; yet by the general

[1] R. H. Benson, *Cam. His.*, Vol. III, p. 48.
[2] Ibid., p. 51.
[3] *Cam. His.*, Vol. III, p. 52.

diffusion of knowledge, the widening of the limits of learning and philosophy, the impetus given to research, art and literature, the removal of unjustifiable prejudices, we inherit a treasure that could hardly have been ours without payment of a heavy price.[1]

With the rise of the spiritual authority into a position of ultimate control in the State, the progress of our Western world had been towards a condition in which an almost complete paralysis of the speculative and critical faculties of the human mind supervened; and in which men sank gradually into a stupor of ignorance and credulity.[2] Mr. Lecky's sombre description of the conditions of the world as they presented themselves throughout this period can hardly be considered to be over-stated. The spirit which prevailed had produced a condition of thought in which the very sense of truth seemed blotted out from the minds of men.[3] During these ages every mental disposition which philosophy pronounces essential for legitimate research was almost uniformly branded as a sin, and a large proportion of the most deadly intellectual vices were deliberately inculcated as virtues. It was sinful to study with equal attention and with an indifferent mind both sides, sinful to resolve to follow the evidence wherever it might lead, sinful to give a qualified assent to indecisive arguments, sinful to recognise the moral or intellectual excellence of opponents. The theologians, by destroying every book that could generate discussion, by encouraging

[1] *Cam. His.*, p. 55.
[2] Kidd, p. 283.
[3] Ibid., and Lecky, Vol. I, p. 397.

a spirit of boundless credulity, and, above all, by persecuting with atrocious cruelty those who differed from their opinions, succeeded in almost entirely arresting the action of the European mind.[1]

It is interesting to observe that there are men like Cardinal Gasquet who can close their eyes to this, and airily proceed to elaborate the thesis that Lutheranism was, for the moment, the enemy of solid scholarship.[2] Truly they strain at the gnat and swallow the camel. Nor must it be supposed that in its attitude to intellectual freedom the Roman Catholic Church showed any change of heart when the Counter-Reformation began. The Inquisition was armed with new powers and inspired with new energy. The civil sword was unsparingly employed both in Spain and in Italy.[3] If the semblance of Protestantism showed itself it was instantly met, not by petty, teasing persecution, but by persecution of that sort which bows down and crushes all but a very few select spirits. He who was suspected of heresy knew that he must purge himself to the satisfaction of a severe and vigilant tribunal,—or die by fire.[4] As is well known, in the Netherlands, from first to last, more than fifty thousand people were put to death as heretics.[5]

We have, in fact, travelled to the brink of the period when the flames of universal religious persecution appear on the horizon. We are close to the time when the Spanish Peninsula is to be invaded by a tyranny unknown in the world of the

[1] Kidd, p. 284.
[2] See above, p. 25.
[3] *Cam. His.*, Vol. III, p. 33.
[4] Macaulay.
[5] Froude, pp. 40, 41.

ancients,—the Holy Inquisition.[1] Religious persecution is to prevail throughout Western Europe as never before. Paul IV is to institute the Index Expurgatorius, and Charles V and Philip II of Spain are to become associated with that sentence of death which was formulated against all the inhabitants of the Netherlands as heretics; the spiritual authority leaving to the able and willing civil power the selection of the victims, all being alike sentenced to a common grave, so that it was possible for any of them without warning, difficulty, or trial to be carried to the scaffold or to the stake.[2]

Heretical works were sought out and destroyed. Books which were once in every house were so effectually suppressed that no copy of them is now to be found in the most extensive libraries. One in particular, entitled *Of the Benefits of the Death of Christ*, had this fate. It was written in Tuscan, was many times reprinted, and was eagerly read in every part of Italy. But the inquisitors detected in it the Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith alone. They proscribed it; and it is now as hopelessly lost as the second decade of Livy.[3]

The best form of defence is attack. When there is no case, abuse plaintiff's attorney. The *Catholic Encyclopaedia*[4] informs us that the Reformation caused indescribable suffering among the people. It occasioned civil wars which lasted decades. Peoples were oppressed and enslaved. Countless art treasures and manuscripts were destroyed.

[1] Kidd, p. 285, and Ranke, Vol. II, section 6.
[2] Ibid., p. 286, and Motley, Ch. 2.
[3] Macaulay.
[4] Art., Reformation, p. 710.

It is not quite clear what the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* means by this indescribable suffering among the people caused by the Reformation; but a well-known Roman Catholic writer, in referring to the Peasants' Revolt in Germany, mentions the unfortunate peasantry who had been led to slaughter by Luther's writings.[1] As a matter of fact, as a Jesuit author admits, "had there never been a Luther, the Rising of the Peasants might have been anticipated."[2] The peasants had begun to realise their own strength. A peasant revolt was no new thing. And the oppression and discontent were not confined to any one country of Europe.[3]

Here, practically for the first time, in the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, in England, appeared the demand that the peasant should be free. About the same time came the Jacquerie in France, fiercer, bloodier, and more ineffectual.[4] Late in the day Germany had her Peasants' Rising. It was characterised by those excesses in which intolerable wrong is prone to seek revenge; but a strong wave of anti-clerical feeling and of social discontent prevailed among the peasants in many parts of Germany *before* Luther came forward. Nevertheless the gospel of freedom, the mistaken approbation found in passages of Scripture for the desire to obtain equality and a juster distribution of property, incited the peasants to make extravagant and violent demands. The example, moreover, of the great spiritual upheaval rendered the crisis acute.[5]

Many rose in the very name of that Christian

[1] MacCaffrey, Vol I, p. xi.
[2] Grisar, Vol. III, p. 84.
[3] MacCaffrey, Vol. I, p. 32.
[4] F. S. Marvin, p. 127.
[5] Grisar, Vol. II, p. 190.

Liberty that Luther proclaimed, inspired by his fine preaching of a gospel that gave men the hope of freedom. Their Twelve Articles were supported by texts[1] from the Bible, and the peasants demanded that if they were deceived Luther should correct them by Scripture.[2]

At first, Luther admitted that some, at least, of the demands were just and equitable. To us, indeed, they seem surprisingly moderate. About 1539, however, the great Reformer "threw all discretion to the winds, and ventured to speak out strongly in favour of armed resistance."[3] His hatred of anarchy made him brutal towards the peasants. In his opinion, once they had risen and plundered convents and castles, they deserved to be killed like mad dogs.[4]

Hence, Luther and his movement may be held partly responsible both for the ideals of life and conduct, which led to the risings of the peasants, and for the ferocity with which the insurrection was suppressed. In connection with each of these points, though, some comment is required. The ideal of life and conduct which Luther taught and which, to some extent, encouraged the peasants to revolt, was the ideal of liberty. The ideal of life and conduct which caused Luther to condemn the excesses that followed, was an ideal of law and order, which involved a fierce—perhaps a savage—hatred of anarchy.[4] Only those who know what a rising of this kind means are fit to condemn him.

[1] E. B. art., Reformation.
[2] F. S. Marvin, p. 127.
[3] Grisar, Vol. III, p. 70.
[4] F. S. Marvin, p. 159. Creighton, Vol. VI, p. 303.

What are we to say of the accusation brought by the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* that the Reformation occasioned civil wars lasting decades? Firstly, it may be said that for the fact that the religious ferment did not lead at once into the chaos of the Thirty Years War, we have three elements to thank: (*a*) the Emperor's difficulties, (*b*) the wily statecraft of Charles V, (*c*) Luther's courageous common sense and tolerance. "I can," he said, "by no means admit that false teachers should be put to death."[1] Then again, although the seventeenth century, the time of the Thirty Years War, is a barren period for German culture; and although the debit account of the wars of religion is heavy, this at least may be put to the credit of these convulsions, they gave an impulse to political thought, e.g., the Huguenots in appealing to a law higher than human authority stimulated old speculations on the nature and limits of government and sovereignty.[2] These comments, nevertheless, do not cut to the root. The *Catholic Encyclopaedia* says that it was only gradually, and owing to forces which did not essentially spring from the Reformation, that the social wounds were healed. It is equally true to say that it was only gradually, and owing to forces which did not essentially spring from the Reformation, that the social wounds referred to had opened. During three generations religion had been the mainspring of politics; but the revolutions and civil wars of France, Scotland, Holland, Sweden, the long struggle between Philip and Elizabeth, only partially originated in theological disputes. These troubles *were* partly religious, but

[1] F. S. Marvin, p. 161. [2] Ibid., p. 208.

a great change took place later: the contest which raged in Germany lost its religious character. "The alliance of Richelieu and Gustavus Adolphus marks the time at which the great religious struggle terminated." The war which followed, and which lasted until the peace of Westphalia (1648), was a war for the equilibrium of Europe.[1]

We have now seen that among the Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct was the great Counter-Reformation, which was moral and intellectual. It was also doctrinal. Indirectly Luther helped the regeneration of the Catholic Church through his apostacy, which made possible the Council of Trent. Hitherto external obstacles, short-sightedness, indolence and worldly aims had interfered. Theology profited by the struggle with Protestantism by gaining a clearer dogma on threatened points. This is a gain which we must not underrate.[2] The Decrees of Trent are the shadow of the Reformation. The best forces which the Church had at its command co-operated. It was an immense undertaking to shape out dogmas from the almost unlimited material provided by Scholasticism and Monasticism, after such a long period of silence, extending over centuries. Such a task would never have been thought of, still less carried out, but for the Reformation and its Augsburg Confession. In all the Decrees, opposition to the evangelical doctrine was the guiding motive. That it was given to Catholicism to understand itself, to give expression

[1] Macaulay. See A. W. Ward. *The Effects of the Thirty Years War*, p. 28. MacCaffrey, p. ix. E. B. art., Reformation.
[2] Grisar, Vol. VI, p. 427.

to its distinctive dogmatic character, and thereby to rescue itself from the uncertainties of the Middle Ages was a debt it owed to the Reformation.[1]

From the Curialist standpoint both the condemnation of the new tenets and a positive statement of Romish doctrine seemed as unnecessary as it was dangerous. That princes and peoples should have imperatively demanded both, that a Council should really have been held, that it gave fixed form to hitherto undefined doctrines, that its decrees resulted in a considerable improvement in the Church, was a triumph for Protestantism. For the first time the question of authority was dealt with by a Council; and the emphasis on preserving the purity of the Gospel, "the puritas evangelii," is positive evidence of the influence of the Reformation. In its declaration that the Old Testament Apocrypha was canonical, that tradition was equal to Scripture as a source of information, that the Vulgate was authoritative, that the Church alone has the right to expound Scripture, we see defined most sharply the opposition to Protestantism.[2]

The proclamation of the Vulgate as so authoritative that no one should presume to reject it on any pretext whatever was a violent measure, which could not be justified even by the law of custom; for the usage here sanctioned was by no means fully established even in the Middle Ages. It was, indeed, directly opposed to the age. This was apparent during the deliberations. Many voices were raised demanding that priority should be given to Scripture. There seems no doubt that the

[1] Harnack, p. 26. [2] Ibid., pp. 35, 36.

action of the Council was due to the fact that the attacks of the Protestants could not be repelled from Scripture alone.[1]

The Effects of the Reformation on the Ideals of Life and Conduct within the Church, as revealed in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, may be considered from two points of view. It is well to consider the ideals of life and conduct from which the Church was saved. Afterwards one may proceed to consider the ideals of life and conduct which the Council of Trent imposed upon the Roman Church.

From what did the Reformation and the Council of Trent save the Roman Church? About the year 1500 there was a great party, the chief seat of which was in Rome at the Papal Court, which treated religion and the Church simply as outward forms of dominion and sought to maintain them by force, officialism, and an oppressive system of dues. Although this "secularising" of the Church had become a heavy burden, not only on consciences, but on every vigorous force of life, and on all ideals; it was, nevertheless, carried on from Rome without shrinking or shame.

It is of no importance that some in their hearts were still devoted to the cause for which they laboured. We are concerned with the effects of the system; and for this party, the Curialists, old dogma had value only if it was part of the usage of the Roman Church. This party had the strongest inducements for giving to modern decisions of the Curia the same authority as dogma. For them there

[1] Harnack, pp. 41, 42.

was only one dogma, the use and wont of the Roman Church. If an old tradition or passage of Scripture was inconvenient, the new principle that had now made its appearance was produced, that only the Church, that is to say only Rome, had the right to expound. Hence arose the startling novelty of attributing the same sacredness to Papal decisions as to the Decrees of the Great Councils.[1]

It was this innovation which perplexed Luther. As a conservative theologian he knew that the Pope had no power to make new articles of faith. Even if the greater part of Christendom agreed with the Pope, it would not be heresy to dissent unless the matter had been decided by a General Council. For instance, the greater part of Christendom, in those days, believed in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, but it was not heretical to reject that doctrine.[2] Luther was willing to admit that the Pope was "the ministerial head of the Church," but the faith of the Church depended on the definitions of General Councils.[3] The question raised by Luther touched upon points of admitted difficulty, about which various opinions had been expressed by learned theologians; but no fundamental doctrine was involved. On the other hand, the question of Indulgences was one which could not be touched without involving some *practical* changes in the conduct of the business of the Papal Court. Slowly and persistently the ever-increasing number of officials had built up a system on the basis of Papal autocracy. It was very inconvenient to have any

[1] Harnack, p. 5.
[2] Creighton, Vol. VI, p. 84.
[3] Ibid., p. 86.

part of this system challenged. It would be undignified to have to explain. No man must dispute the plain meaning of a document which bore the Pope's signature or proceeded from any of the Papal courts. If this were once allowed there would be no end to the practical difficulties which would ensue. It was only necessary to put on a bold front and state in all its solidity the claim of the Papacy to unlimited obedience, which the Lateran Council had accepted without reserve. What the Church had accepted[1] must be enforced. Thus the Papal policy towards Luther was the result of the triumph of officials over the statesmen in the Papal Court.[2]

There can be on doubt that the whole mode of procedure of the Curia at this time was a way of burying the old dogma. Obey and submit to be trained. That was the way of salvation. But the training was provided by the Sacrament and by the ludicrously small offerings to which the Church could impart the value of moral acts.[3] For the most thorough-going Romanism, so far as it rises to the question of salvation at all, the superiority of the Christian religion consists in its being a system which produces sanctification of life, so that a man becomes well-pleasing to God under conditions which are easily fulfilled. Faith had always been regarded by Catholicism as something merely preliminary; it had now shrivelled up into submission to an apparatus. Just before the Reformation many employed in working the machine in Rome had a humanistic smile on their lips, but they never went so far as to

[1] Creighton, Vol. VI, p.
[2] Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 91.
[3] Harnack, p. 9.

express vigorous scorn. There was too much convenience in the system.[1]

The effects of this on ideals of life and conduct are not difficult to discern. If this course of things had gone on, and victory seemed already to await it about the year 1500, dogma would have continued to exist in an outward way, but inwardly both the old dogma and dogmatic Christianity in general would have disappeared. Their place would have been been taken by a form of religion belonging to a lower stage.[2]

So much for the ideal of life and conduct from which the Church was saved. We must now proceed to consider the ideal of life and conduct which the Council of Trent imposed upon the Roman Church. At first sight the two ideals are not vastly different. When one considers not only the theory of indulgences, but the theory and practice of "benedictions and sacramentalia," it becomes clear how far the Church had drifted, not only from what is Christian, but even from what is spiritual. By the blessing and the prayers of the priest the liturgical vessels were held to become not merely sanctified, but fitted to produce various saving effects in those who used them devoutly. They bore in themselves something divine, and it was taught that a certain religious veneration must be paid to them. Candles, even, were said to impart, on the ground of, and by virtue of, the prayer of the Church, divine blessing and protection, especially against the spirits of darkness.[3] Incense, too, was the vehicle of divine

[1] Harnack, p. 8.
[2] Ibid., p. 9.
[3] Ibid., p. 55 and note 3.

protection and blessing, and had power to drive Satan from the soul. The incense clouds brought all they touched into a consecrated atmosphere. Garments used in worship did not lose their benediction by being mended, unless the unconsecrated piece was larger than the consecrated portion.[1]

It is not going too far to say that the Church of Rome by declaring to be true, saving, and divine, all the usages she had adopted on her long progress through the Middle Ages, withdrew from the struggle begun by Luther to reach a true inward understanding of the Christian religion.[1] In the Decrees of the Council of Trent the Papacy formally embodied its refusal to treat the question of religion at the level to which that question had been raised by Luther. It held firmly to the ancient mediaeval stage. "That is pre-eminently the significance of the Great Council."

What has been the effect of this upon the ideals of life and conduct within the Roman Catholic Church? It has often been said that Catholicism is an objective religion, whereas Protestantism is subjective. The statement, if clearly understood and sufficiently guarded, is both true and suggestive. From what has been said above it will be clear that the Reformation saved the Roman Church from a religion which would have been even lower than fetichism; nothing more, in fact, than a commercial transaction. What the Council of Trent substituted for this was a distinctly objective religion, little better than fetichism. Fortunately the Roman Catholic is often better than his system. In a sense all genuine religion

[1] Harnack, p. 55 and note 3.

is subjective. It is the meeting of God and man within the soul in awe, aspiration, and affection. There is not much difference "between Tauler and Wesley, Pascal and Channing." On the lower level of discipleship, however, religious men seem to belong to two churches. One interposes "a machinery of mediation," sacraments, priesthood, discipline, and ritual, between the soul and its Infinite Object. The other leaves the spirit face to face with God. Both can be good. Priest and sacrament may be a means of communion between the soul and God. They no doubt very often are, to many members of the Roman Church. They can, however, become a wall erected between the soul and God, so that a man can no longer open his heart to the Divine Grace, but must be blessed by way of water or of oil, of bread or of wine. As these hindrances multiply and sacraments become available only on conditions laid down by the Church, e.g., Baptism, Confirmation, Confession, Penance, Intercession of Saints, and of the Blessed Mary, the Ideals of Life and Conduct become very different. The Saviour of the World becomes an angry Judge. The attitude of devotion and worship to Him becomes almost impossible. So with the World to Come. Instead of the Christian Ideal of Life and Conduct being a spiritual life expressed in conduct actuated by motives of love and service, it becomes an attempt to scramble into Heaven by means of the above-mentioned conditions, and by others, such as Indulgences, Masses, Extreme Unction. Man is separated from God by a thousand barriers, which he cannot leap, and on which his attention is fixed as the proper objects of religious

desire.[1] This, I think, is roughly the Ideal of Life and Conduct imposed upon the Roman Church by the Council of Trent.

Its strength can be seen by contrasting Roman Catholic and Protestant missions. It may be contended that Roman Catholic missionaries, by the principle of "accommodation," try to make the passage from paganism to Christianity as easy as possible. People may urge that the object appears very often to be merely to baptise and to enrol, as among the Indians in Mexico. It has been asserted that Roman conversions are unreal. As an example is often given the work of Francis Xavier and his followers in China and Japan. A few years after his death there was scarcely one convert left.

All this may or may not be true. Probably a *tu quoque* could easily be maintained. It is, anyhow, a fact that the idea of a Universal Church which just then inspired Catholics to undertake the conversion of newly discovered continents was lacking amongst the Reformers.[2]

The Jesuits invaded all the countries which the great maritime discoveries of the preceding age had revealed. In the depths of Peruvian mines, at the marts of the African slave caravans, on the shores of the Spice Islands, converts were made. In regions which neither avarice nor curiosity had tempted their countrymen to enter, the Jesuits preached and disputed,—in tongues no other European understood.[3]

On the other hand, Protestantism had for aggressive

[1] Beard, pp. 112, 113. See also Lindsay, p. 439 and p. 444.
[2] Grisar, Vol. VI, p. 213. [3] Macaulay.

purposes no organisation at all. The operations of the Catholic Church took in the whole world. The Reformed Churches were merely national. The spiritual forces of Protestantism were a local militia, useful to repel an invasion, but not liable for service overseas. Rome also had a local militia; but she had, in addition, forces which were available at a moment's notice for foreign service, however dangerous or disagreeable.[1]

Then again, while the whole zeal of the Catholics was directed against the Protestant, Protestantism split into innumerable sects. As early as 1528 it was observed that, though the Reformers "began so late, yet there are not only as many sects almost as men, but also the masters themselves change their minds, and their opinions, every day." In Bohemia there is one faith in the town, another in the field: one in Prague, another in the next town: in Prague itself, one faith in one street, another in the next.[2] Hence while the power of Rome was bent to the sole purpose of waging war against the Reformers; the strength which ought to have fought the battle of the Reformation was exhausted by internal strife. In England, for example, the jails were filled with men who, though zealous for the Reformation, did not agree with the Court on all points of doctrine and discipline.[1] In fact the whole zeal of the Protestants was directed against one another.

Consequently it is with justice that the Reformers are reproached for their lack of missionary enterprise. One can make excuses for them. In the sixteenth century Protestants had not the same

[1] Macaulay. [2] Quoted by Gasquet, p. 85 (*More's Dyalogue*).

access to heathen lands as had their rivals. They were, moreover, fully occupied defending their faith in Europe. Their missionary province was "the Paganised Christian Church."[1] This, however, is not the root of the matter. The view held by the Reformers was that systematic missionary activity was the duty of the Apostles alone. And it was believed that the Apostles had completed their work. The Gospel had been preached by them and the Kingdom of God firmly established in all places under Heaven.

Another consideration which carried equal weight in those days, and which was a more essential part of the theology of the Reformers, arose out of the doctrine of Election. God has everywhere His elect, whom by divers means He leads to Salvation; but the method employed is a matter of sovereign grace. Human missionary agency was not thought to be a part of the Divine plan.[2]

Luther and his contemporaries, moreover, were convinced that the end of the world was at hand. Luther never gives this as a reason for ignoring missionary work. And of course a belief in the imminence of the Second Advent is not of itself a bar to missionary enterprise. Generally, as a matter of fact, it is an incentive. Still it has been thought that this was a contributary cause.[3]

Anyhow, for some generations after the Reformation there was no real missionary enthusiasm among Protestants, in spite of the fact that their fundamental principles "brought back the whole work of

[1] Warnack, p. 10.
[2] Ibid., pp. 10–25 and *passim*.
[3] Ibid., p. 16.

missions to Apostolic lines," and "restored the true substance of missionary preaching by earnest proclamation of the Gospel."[1] It was nearly two centuries before the Churches of Europe, which had the open Bible in their hands, realised that it was their duty to impart its message to the heathen. Some of the Reformers actually thought such work useless, or even wrong.[2]

On the other hand, it is widely held by Protestant missionaries to-day that, although large numbers of Roman Catholic missionaries furnish us with noble examples of self-sacrifice, yet that their methods "tend to induce wholly superficial conversions."[3] There is no visible effect on the character of the convert. In India, moreover, they are said to carry the method of "accommodation" to such a length that the difference between Christianity and idolatry is obliterated.[4] Nor must it be supposed that the glowing account we have just given of the activities of Jesuits and others in the sixteenth century would apply to later times. As an offset to Cardinal Wiseman's criticism of Protestant missions in the "Thirties," it should be remembered that at the beginning of the nineteenth century Roman Catholic missionaries numbered hardly a thousand.[5] In the eighteenth century Roman Catholic missions were "well-nigh dormant."[6]

[1] Warnack, p. 10.
[2] Robinson, p. 42.
[3] Ibid., p. 140.
[4] Ibid., p. 141.
[5] Ibid., p. 138, and *Wiseman's Lectures on the Church*, Lecture VII.
[6] Ibid., p. 137.

II

The Holy Catholic Church

II

Separation of Religion from the Church.

THE contrast is very marked between Roman Catholic success and Protestant failure in the mission field during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; in spite of the fact that missionary enterprise is "a clear consequence of the priestly, consecrated position of the believer."[1] This is true both practically and theoretically.

It is true practically, in spite of the fact that until the eighteenth century the doctrine of Grace encouraged "a certain passiveness which checked energetic action";[2] for missions struck their first deep roots in the age of Pietism. Count Zinzendorf began a strong forward movement (1731). Indeed the vast missionary energy of the Moravian Brethren has been deemed "a unique fact in the history of the Christian Church."[2] In England, too, where the "politico-religious" struggles delayed evangelistic work, it was the spiritual revival associated with the Methodists which ultimately proved to have provided the soil in which a new missionary life took root."[3]

Now Methodism was not independent of the Reformation. In 1736 John Wesley came into contact, in Georgia, with some Moravians and

[1] M'Cheyne Edgar, p. 172.
[2] Warnack, p. 31. Robinson, p. 42.
[3] Ibid., p. 71–73.

"found righteousness and peace through Faith in the Crucified Christ." To this experience Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans materially contributed. George Whitefield, also, owed his acquaintance with evangelical truth to *German* Pietism. It was from reading the writings of A. H. Francke that "the beam of a Divine light broke into his soul, like a flash." With these two men were soon united a small band, chiefly from the Church of England, which had been led to a living faith.

At the beginning Methodism was not a missionary movement, but its principles pointed almost inevitably to a world-wide activity. Its zeal for testifying to the power of the Cross and its powerful impulse to save others may be summed up in the words of Wesley,

> O that the world might taste and see
> The wonders of His Grace:
> The arms of love that compass me
> Might all mankind embrace.

Theoretically, also, missionary enterprise follows from the Priesthood of Believers. It has always been held that the Visible Church does not exactly correspond even with that part of the Invisible Church which is still militant here on earth. Even Roman theologians admit that the Visible Church contains some who will ultimately be found not to be members of the Invisible Church. They will even acknowledge sometimes that outside the Visible Church are some who will eventually prove to be a part of the Invisible Church.[1] Luther, however, went further. To him the Church was the "collection of believing

[1] Streeter, p. 180. Lindsay, p. 481.

Christians."[1] It is invisible and known only to God; an ideal Church in process of being realised: the company of faithful people who have lived, who are living, and who will live."[2] Hence it follows that a preacher driven from home, or a faithful layman in a heathen country would be expected to exercise his priestly function and preach the Gospel.[3] In his address to the nobility, Luther says that if a body of Christians had no priest among them, they might elect one to baptise, to celebrate Mass, to absolve, and to preach. He would be as truly ordained as if consecrated by all the bishops. That is why, in a case of necessity, any man can baptise and absolve. If all were not priests this would be impossible.[4] Christians used to choose their bishops and priests out of the community. They were afterwards confirmed in their office, that is, ordained, because no man puts himself forward, or takes upon himself without election to do what we all alike have power to do. If a thing is common to all, no man may take it to himself without the wish and command of the community.[5]

In contrast to this one may observe that the Council of Trent made Apostolic Succession an article of faith.[6] Protestants, however, except the High Church party among the Scottish Presbyterians, regard the whole conception of validity of orders as unmeaning.[7] With them, Ordination is the conveyance, not of power, but of authority. According to the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, the function or

[1] Creighton, Vol. VI, p. 156.
[2] M'Cheyne Edgar, p. 104.
[3] Warnack, p. 14.
[4] M'Cheyne Edgar, p. 176.
[5] Ibid., p. 178.
[6] Ibid., p. 188.
[7] *Foundations*, p. 395 (note 2).

office of Holy Orders is to transmit and perpetuate those mystical powers of the priesthood whereby the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar is consecrated and offered up in sacrifice.[1]

Here is a big difference. It may well be called a difference in Ideals of Life and Conduct. The unbroken reign of episcopal institutions may be undisputed from the third to the sixteenth centuries; but the non-episcopal communions can now point to some three hundred years of vigorous spiritual life and Christian experience. They may, accordingly, not without reason, claim to be regarded as something more than a temporary anomaly.[2]

For the Protestant there is no need of Church or of Council. The only authority to preach, teach, preside over services, is derived from the congregation.[3] According to Luther, the Church is an Invisible Church, founded on a Priesthood of Believers who enjoy the consciousness of personal communion with God.[4] Sacraments are, at most, "points of personal contact with Jesus Christ." If we look to them, and trust to them, we are, according to the Reformed doctrine, in danger of straying from the truth.[5]

Such theories seemed, in the sixteenth century, to strike at the very root of all authority. One might doubt whether the supreme power rested in the Pope alone, or in a Council alone, or in Pope and Council combined; but Luther's teaching was

[1] *Cath. Ency.*, Art. Ref.
[2] *Foundations*, p. 386. See also Streeter, pp. 153–157.
[3] *Cath. Ency.*, Art. Ref.
[4] Creighton, Vol. VI, p. 177.
[5] *Foundations*, p. 388.

revolutionary. It seemed to many at the time that civil order could not possibly be maintained if every man was going to make a religion for himself.[1]

Luther's explanation was that if Christ's sheep were fed on the Gospel, and if their rulers were good and pious, there would be no need "to lade the Church with human traditions." The power of the Word of God could regenerate human society by its own inherent force. To Luther the will of God was the supreme authority. It was a living voice with a message to each individual soul.[2]

What, then, of the sacraments? There are, I think, three points of view we ought to consider Religious requirements may consist merely in doing this or that. So in fact it happened in the popular mediaeval system. Protestantism was a reaction. Starting from the position of Justification by Faith only, Luther gained a conception of the Christian life which was in opposition to that of the mediaeval Church. The notion of a mighty institution, founded by Christ and endowed with His gifts, which watched over the individual from the cradle to the grave, and by its observances disciplined him into saintliness,—this splendid ideal of mediaeval Christendom dropped entirely away from Luther.[3]

If the soul was saved by flinging itself through faith into the arms of Christ's mercy, it was clear that the institutions of the Church were to be criticised according to whether they helped or hindered. Luther questioned the need of the

[1] Creighton, Vol. VI, p. 177
[2] Ibid., p. 180.
[3] Ibid., pp. 155, 156.

machinery at all. If a man believed in Christ he was justified before God by the act of Faith.[1]

It may be, as Bishop Gore suggests, that both mediaeval Catholicism and Lutheranism are one-sided developments. He holds the view that preliminary justifying faith does but warrant admission into the divine society, the Body of Christ, by baptism. The sacramental gifts and personal faith are no more in antithesis than food and digestion, or than the virtue which went out of Christ and the faith in Him which made men whole. Sacraments do not save us without faith. Faith which leaves us voluntarily isolated from the Communion of one Body is not what St. Paul meant by justifying faith. The Church is the household of God: The home of His people. She guides and desciplines their souls. She feeds them with the Bread of Life.[2] There is, somehow, in the Eucharist, as Christian worshippers in all ages have felt, an influence by which Heaven meets earth and earth Heaven; and the Lord's Body discerned by Faith is that by which man is made one with God, and God with man.[3]

I am not prepared to say that this is a typically Protestant doctrine; but it is important for our purpose, because it shows that there is a stage between the decrees of the Council of Trent and Luther's doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers. It is not easy to determine what theory of the sacraments is most widely held by those Protestants who emphasise this Priesthood, or, so far as that goes, to discover any unanimity amongst those

[1] Creighton, Vol. VI, pp. 155, 156.
[2] Gore, pp. 35–37.
[3] *Foundations*, p. 392.

Protestants with whom this principle is not so prominent. Nor am I at all sure that theory is not here misleading. Anyhow, I would like to suggest that the practice and feeling of the ordinary worshipper will throw more light upon the Protestant view of the sacraments.

Logically, there is no reason why those who exalt the Priesthood of the Laity should neglect sacramental truth. Even that *locus classicus*, the Epistle to the Hebrews, builds on a foundation which contains "the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands."[1] Salvation is by Faith alone. Very good. That is as much as to say that a man's health can be preserved by walking three miles a day. It does not therefore follow that he will never play cricket. This appears to have been, albeit perhaps unconsciously, the attitude of the average Protestant. He believes that he is saved by faith—alone: but the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has generally bulked largely in his life. Generally speaking, one may say that most Christians, whether Catholic or not, have a feeling towards the Eucharist, either of superstitious awe or of affectionate reverence. Luther himself held strongly to the Real Presence. He rejected Transubstantiation, but his name is always associated with Consubstantiation. The Presence is there, just as fire is in the red-hot iron. Everybody, too, remembers the stress he laid upon "Hoc est meum corpus."

It seems like emphasising the obvious, to point out that nearly all the important Christian denominations give a big place in public worship to Holy

[1] Heb., vi. 2.

Communion; yet one might easily lose sight of this when reading the remarks of some writers. Even Harnack speaks of Luther's attacks on the sacraments.[1] Seignobos speaks of the overthrow of the greater part of them.[2] The *Catholic Encyclopaedia* would give the same impression.[3] It is certainly true that the Calvinists kept alive the iconoclastic spirit of Zwingli, and wished for nothing in public worship which the New Testament does not sanction[4]; but the New Testament does sanction Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These, at least, have been retained by all the best-known Free Churches, except the Society of Friends. Ordination, too, prevails. Anglicans, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, all ordain their ministers. Most of them also practice something corresponding to "laying on of hands."

The Lutherans wished to retain ceremonies not forbidden by the Bible, and left unmolested rich altars, tapers, crucifixes, and fonts. In 1738 Wesley saw a Lutheran minister at Meissen in chasuble of gold and scarlet, and a vast cross, both behind and before. The service-books retain part of the ancient liturgical outlines. There are forms for Confirmation and for *Private* Confession. Ornaments of the altar are permitted, and there is a laudatory reference in one of their Prayer Books to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. Baptismal Regeneration, moreover, as well as the Real Presence is taught.[4]

[1] Harnack, pp. 216–221, *passim*.
[2] Seignobos (Mediaeval), p. 289.
[3] *Cath. Ency.*, Art. Reformation.
[4] *Foundations*, p. 84. Dean Stanley, also, was much struck by the gorgeous vestments in Seden. See his Lectures, p. 7 (Dent).

It may be true that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the foundation of the religious life, in the eyes of the Evangelicals, was Justification by Faith and Conversion. Conversion, no doubt, they interpreted, somewhat like the Methodists, as a sudden transformation of the soul which felt itself free from the sense of sin by an intimate assurance given it by God,—quite independent of any sacrament or priest. It may be that for sacramental dogma they had little concern.[1] These things may still be true of Evangelicals, but it must not be forgotten that they look to Holy Communion as one of the most important and sacred things in life. It is indeed, noteworthy that this is true of the Evangelical *Free* Churchmen also.[2]

We have stressed this point, because there is sometimes a tendency in considering the Ideal of Life and Conduct involved in the doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers to suppose that it lacks the sacramental element. Before leaving this subject it may be as well to glance quite briefly at the Seven Sacraments in order to see how they stand amongst the Protestant bodies. The distinctive feature of one denomination is the importance it attaches to the right form of baptism. Apart from the Baptists, infant baptism is practised nearly everywhere, throughout the Protestant world. Confirmation, I believe, is limited to Anglicans and Lutherans. Of the Holy Eucharist enough has been said above. Penance has to a great extent disappeared; but both Anglicans and Lutherans

[1] Thureau-Dangin, Vol. I, p. xxxix.
[2] See Gore, pp. 35–37.

retain Confession and Absolution; the Lutherans having a form even for Private Confession.[1] In the English Prayer Book the Confession and Absolution are "General," but there are three forms, one for Morning and Evening Prayer, one in the Communion Service, and another in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, and it may be argued that the Absolution is sacramental, a means of grace.[2] In the Order of the Visitation of the Sick, too, private confession is authorised. The rubric says, "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled by any weighty matter. After which Confession the Priest shall absolve him, (if he humbly and heartily desire it)." The form of Absolution which follows refers to the power which Our Lord Jesus Christ has left to His Church to absolve.

Many, no doubt, would argue that the Church of England is Catholic. That is true; but the point at present is that the English Church as we have it is a product of the Reformation. It is not a product in the same way as the Lutheran Church, which began with Luther; but the modern Church of England owes much to the Reformers. It is Catholic: it is also "Reformed."

To continue. Extreme Unction is the only sacrament which has entirely disappeared. Holy Orders remains. Even the laying on of hands in the Ordination ceremony has been retained by many of the Evangelical Free Churches In fact, the loss which it is thought has been sustained, on the sacramental

[1] See above, p. 53. Streeter, p. 153–157.
[2] C. Wheatley, *On the Common Prayer*, pp. 101–103. (1858).

side, by Protestants is often exaggerated. Whatever their theories, their practice and their sentiments show clearly that their lives are far from being devoid of sacramental content. As we have said before, Christian worshippers in all ages have felt that in the Eucharist there is an influence by which "Heaven meets earth, and earth Heaven."[1]

At the Reformation a good deal of impedimenta was jettisoned, but what was of real value remained, if not in the theology, at least in the hearts of the worshippers. Let us consider what Protestants may be alleged to have lost, through emphasising the ideal of life involved in the Priesthood of Believers. It is no longer possible for them by making use of the proper prayers to avail themselves of the "rich treasure of Indulgences attached to them by the Sovereign Pontiffs."[2] Whether this is a loss is a point that cannot profitably be discussed in such a brief survey as this. So much depends upon one's preconceptions. At the time of the Council of Trent, however, it is certain that this was amongst the impedimenta. The Council *abolished* Indulgence preachers.[3] Indulgences themselves were certainly treated cautiously; but the abuses were admitted, and their removal strongly insisted on.[4] The decrees about Purgatory contained the indirect admission that much mischief had been done by it, and that Christendom had been led into superstition. There is allusion to base gain, scandals, and

[1] Gore, pp. 35–37. See also *Foundations*, p. 392.
[2] *Manual of Indulgences*, p.3. See above, pp. 10–12.
[3] Waterworth, p. 277.
[4] Harnack, p. 55.

stumbling-blocks for the faithful."[1] So with many other things which some would say that Protestants have "lost." The Invocation and Worship of Saints, the use of relics and pictures, are dealt with rapidly; so that anyone unacquainted with the practice of the Church might conclude that only unimportant abuses were being discussed; nevertheless the Council decrees that if any abuses *have* crept into these holy and salutary observances, the Holy Synod has the intensest desire that they be forthwith abolished.

We have "lost" Auricular Confession, and it has been urged that this has produced an effect upon our Ideals of Life and Conduct. The suggestion of a variation of type and of spiritual flavour between Protestant and Catholic saints may seem fanciful, and no doubt the two shade off into each other in concrete cases by imperceptible gradations. The attempt to distinguish them will necessarily be impressionistic; nevertheless the impression is difficult to resist that the two types are different and that the Church would be poorer for the loss of either. In Protestantism we look for uprightness, strength, veracity: in Catholicism for a certain peculiar tenderness and humility; a character built up and fostered not only by the Mass, but by the spiritual Confession.[2] In spite of the abuses by which Confession has from time to time been attended, it may be said, upon the whole,—when not mechanical because compulsory—to have been justified by its fruits.[3] So says one writer, and there may be a good deal in his contention.

[1] Harnack, p. 54. [2] *Foundations*, p. 396. [3] Ibid., p. 397.

There is, nevertheless, the other side. Abuses *have* occurred. One wonders whether they are not inevitable. The whole question has been discussed at great length by Mr. H. C. Lea on several occasions,[1] and we propose to do no more than indicate two or three of the commonest objections to Auricular Confession.

It is a mortal sin for the confessor to omit to push his enquiries into every detail.[2] It is considered, moreover, better never to go to Confession than to make a bad confession by concealing sins through shame. "This maxim must be impressed especially upon little girls, who more easily allow themselves to be overcome by shame."[3] In Confession the priest should supply its deficiency by opportune questions.[4] The remark about little girls and shame must, I think, be interpeted in the light of a later passage in the same book,[5] where priests are urged to speak plainly on sexual matters. There is some reason to believe that the modern tendency has been for the priest to relax this inquisitorial practice, partly through an increase in refinement and delicacy, and partly because of the diminished importance of penance. Nevertheless purity and innocence are not safe from foul and indecent questions.[6] Whether contamination can be avoided is by no means certain. Seduction of women in the Confessional has caused great trouble in the Church. Council after Council sought to suppress it.[7] In Granada (1559) and in

[1] Lea, Vol. I, pp. 370–375, and *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, 2nd ed., pp. 350, 566. 632.
[2] Ibid., pp. 375, 376.
[3] Frassinetti, p. 195.
[4] O'Reilly, p. 103.
[5] Frassinetti, p. 221.
[6] Lea, Vol. I, p. 375.
[7] Ibid., p. 380.

Italy (1561), the Inquisition was called in.[1] The Church still recognises the danger and seeks to reduce it by rendering confession as nearly public as is consistent with secrecy.[2] The danger to the confessor is also recognised by Catholic theologians.[3]

This subject has been ventilated more than once. I propose to pass on to another evil which the Roman Church has not succeeded in avoiding. I mean the system of Probabilism for which the Jesuits have made themselves particularly responsible. It is a system by which it is possible to wallow in filth, to confound conscience, and in the Confessional to wipe out sin with sin. There are ethical hand-books containing descriptions of filthy habits which provoke an outcry of disgust.[4]

Much of what was most revolting has disappeared, but the method remains. To-day, it exerts a ruinous influence on those who receive Confession and upon those who make Confession, to a worse extent, perhaps, than ever before. Forgiveness of sins has become to a large extent a highly refined art. One learns to receive Confession and to give fitting Absolution, as one learns the art of speculation on the Exchange.[5]

At the very time, moreover, when the Jesuits were crushed, appeared Alfonso Liguori (1699–1787). In countless questions even of adultery, perjury, and murder, he transformed the vile into the venial. He has erected a prison from which, if the interests of the

[1] Lea, Vol. I, p. 385.
[2] Ibid., p. 393.
[3] Lea's *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy, passim.*
[4] Harnack, p. 101. On p. 102 there is a "quasi-defence."
[5] Ibid., p. 103.

Church require it, one is not delivered until the uttermost farthing has been paid; but into which one need never enter if a dutiful subjection is maintained.[1]

On the other hand, the growth of Confession in the Church of England suggests to some that we have here a spontaneous impulse of the human heart.[2] This is probably true; but the remark is ambiguous. From what I have seen it appears that the spontaneous impulse of many hearts is to prefer confession to repentance. Salvation is sought by the magic of the formula contained in absolution, rather than in "a change of heart."

Of course the Protestant ideal entails a tremendous responsibility. Perhaps that is why the Church of England has never forbidden Confession. She may have recognised that to do so would be "an outrage on the human soul," which would drive many a true penitent to despair.[2] It is, nevertheless, regarded in the Prayer Book as "a medicine, not a food."[2] General Confession is to be the rule: Auricular Confession for exceptional cases.

Let us now return to our consideration of the results of this doctrine of the Priesthood of Believers. If Protestantism means anything at all it means the right of the individual soul to carry its burden of sin straight to its Divine Redeemer; to obtain direct from Him the assurance of His free pardon.[2] There was a time, however, when the blessings of religion were so identified with the Visible Church that few could conceive of an salvation outside.[3] With the

[1] Harnack, p. 109.
[2] Cruttwell, pp. 163, 164. Vaughan, p. 143.
[3] Oman, pp. 5–7 and p. 21.

conception of Justification by Faith alone came the idea that religion could exist outside any visible organisation.

The civilisation of the Middle Ages was a "Church directed civilisation."[1] Mediaeval Catholicism was "an elastic union of the ascetic life prescribed by authority and the freer natural life in the world."[1] Slowly, however, society became identified, not with Christendom, but with the State. The individual won freedom from all authority, except that of the king.[2] Modern civilisation is everywhere opposed to Church civilisation, and substitutes ideals of civil independence. Authority is now based on inherent power of producing conviction. The immediate consequence "is a growing individualism of conviction, opinion, theory, and practical aim."[1]

The most lasting achievement of the Renaissance was the fundamental change in the position of the individual in society. The importance of the individual, and the importance of the State, these are two landmarks, which bring home to us the change which has taken place in the basis of Western culture. Nor was this movement only practical. It was ethical. Almost everybody nowadays accepts as the will of God that kings should be stronger than emperors or Popes; that thinkers should say what they wish; that the strong should make use of their gifts and opportunities as they desire, provided that the supremacy of the Crown is not impaired.[2]

It is not, nevertheless, entirely correct to say that modern individualism is primarily the achievement of the Renaissance. It is based, rather, on the idea

[1] Troëltsch, pp. 15–17. [2] Benians, pp. ix–xi.

that man's destiny is to acquire "a perfected personality," through the ascent to God, who is the source both of personal life and of the world. It is an ascent which consists in being laid hold of, and moulded, by the Divine Spirit. From the time of the Franciscan movement this ideal was preparing the way for the Renaissance and formed the strongest root of its "individual" civilisation. Finally Protestantism consciously and definitely formulated the principle. Henceforward religion was able to be combined with all the interests and factors of life.[1] It is good that the day entirely consecrated should be the best of all the seven; but with this new point of view every day should be so sanctified.[2] A noble conception this, of business conducted by those who are priests unto God, men who are holy during office hours.

The consequences are most far-reaching. There are no longer special forms of piety and specifically pious ways of life. The exercise of faith has now to be within the great institutions of human life: Marriage, the Family, the State, one's Vocation. Luther transformed the ideal of religious perfection. The effects were immeasurable. At one stroke Religion was released.[3]

The moral ideal was transformed.[4] Marriage, for instance, is no longer a concession to the weak, but a school for the highest morality.[5] Virginity, too, as an ideal disappeared from religion and from ethics. The Family, also, has come to be regarded

[1] Troëltsch, pp. 36, 37, etc.
[2] M'Cheyne Edgar, p. 169.
[3] Ibid., pp. 190–192.
[4] Oman, p. 5.
[5] Ibid., p. 5. Troëltsch, p. 93.

as a specialised form of loving one's neighbour.[1] The Protestant pastorate, a new social order, provides a new pattern of family life.[2] Care for the poor, moreover, is no longer regarded as a means of securing salvation. It is the free service of one's neighbour, which sees in the giving of help its ultimate aim and its only reward. The secular life is no longer suspected of withdrawing the soul from Heaven; but is the true spiritual province for the manifestation of Christian character rooted in faith.[3]

This is very different from the "other worldliness" advocated by the Church in the Middle Ages, and probably by the Roman Catholic Church to-day.[4] Few would object to our taking the *Imitatio Christi* as representative of the old mediaeval ideal on its world-renouncing side. The representation is by no means extreme. The work in fact emanated from a religious movement in Germany and the Low Countries which indicated a desire for a more spiritual Christianity, which culminated in the Reformation The main theme of the *Imitatio* is the disparagement of worldly affairs, of business as well as pleasure, of all secular joys, of all secular learning and literature—even of sacred learning beyond what is absolutely required for instructing the individual soul how to get to Heaven. There is little about works of charity or philanthropy or about being useful to other people even in spiritual ways.[4]

[1] Troëltsch, p. 93.
[2] Ibid., p. 93, where this point of view is elaborated.
[3] M'Cheyne Edgar, pp. 190–192.
[4] Harnack's *Monasticism and the Confessions of St. Augustine*, p. 50. Rashdall, pp. 216–218, and for what follows.

Most modern Christians outside the Roman Catholic Church, and many of those within, would regard the ideal of Thomas à Kempis as at the best very one-sided. Even those who would defend it as an ideal life for some people would refuse to follow him in disparaging the life of the politician, the lawyer, the merchant, the craftsman, the scholar, the artist. Roman Catholics, however, do still hold out the monastic ideal as the highest. "That the number of those who voluntarily select this state[1] may be increased is much to be desired; for from the soil of virginity and perfect continence spring those plants which produce the best fruits for the Church and for society."[2] I believe this utterance is typical.

It is no doubt true[3] that Protestantism, judged by its formal expressions, by its official professions, and by the sentiments prevalent in some religious circles, has not completely thrown off this other worldliness. By abolishing purgatory, by emphasising predestination, by withdrawing the encouragement formerly given to art,—under cover of an often merely nominal service of religion,[4]—it has even in some ways emphasised the austerity of the ecclesiastical ideal, and diminished the joy of human existence.[5]

In spite of this, there are many statements made to-day which are utterly unwarranted. For some years now it has been customary to emphasise the

[1] The state of virginity and perfect continence.
[2] Frassinetti, p. 233.
[3] As has recently been urged by Prof. Troëltsch in *Protestantism and Progress*. (Tr. by W. Montgomery.)
[4] Creighton, Vol. VI, pp. 205–209.
[5] Rashdall, pp. 214, 215. See p. 5 above.

ill-effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct. Many of the so-called ill-effects are either hypothetical or consequences for which the Reformation cannot fairly he held responsible. Döllinger, for instance, asserts that it is now acknowledged that the Reformation has brought upon the English people "a legally existing and officially established pauperism."[1] What this means I can only guess; for the author does not explain. Apparently the meaning is that we now have a Poor Law. That is to say, the State makes provision for paupers, instead of leaving the destitute to fend for themselves or rely upon the charity of the monasteries. Why it should be worse to be a pauper under "a legally existing and officially established pauperism" is not clear. Nor is it obvious why this is a "permanent consequence" of the breach with Rome.

The same author also asserts that by the abolition of Catholic holidays and the transformation of the Christian Sunday into a Jewish Sabbath a further oppressive yoke has been laid upon the poor. All the cheering and enlivening Church festivals of Catholic times—processions, pilgrimages, rustic fêtes, dramatic representations and ceremonies—were abolished. Now in a sense all this is strictly accurate. It is not, however, the whole truth. In the days of Elizabeth, for instance, "cakes and ale," masques and revels, theatres, Twelfth Night celebrations, and pageants, like the one described in Kenilworth, existed. It is, of course, obvious that to-day the poor are not severely restricted in their search after pleasure.

Perhaps Döllinger is thinking of the Puritan

[1] Döllinger, p. 150.

Revolution and the Commonwealth, for he goes on to mention the grim Calvinistic suppression of every social sport and every public amusement on the Sunday. In conclusion he informs us that by these means the whole character of the English people was changed. Formerly known throughout Europe as a people full of genial humour,—as cheerful, "merry England,"—they assumed after the Reformation a sullen, discontented aspect. Music and dancing have disappeared. There is no time even for rest. Nothing is left but drink.

Some of this may have been true when Döllinger wrote, in the Victorian days. The complaint to-day is rather that we are engaged in a mad pursuit of pleasure. Nor do I think England was so gloomy under the Tudors. Those were the days when every gentleman composed sonnets and sang madrigals. All England was a nest of singing birds. Nor was Caroline poetry entirely devoid of joy. It provided us with the "Metaphysical" poets. Even after the Commonwealth there was a certain levity in some of the Restoration comedies. As for dancing, it is not yet entirely extinct. Music, certainly, does not flourish amongst the working classes in England. It seems somewhat arbitrary, nevertheless, to lay the blame for this upon the Reformation. The Welsh have also felt the effects of Protestantism, but they still have Eisteddfods.

It is strange, moreover, to observe the frequency with which people assume that a contempt for the joys of life is peculiar to Calvinism, and a direct consequence of a nation embracing Protestantism, for "other-worldliness" existed earlier than the

sixteenth century,—as we mentioned above.[1] There was a "monastic ideal," a mortifying of the flesh, a glorification of celibacy, in the Middle Ages. In fact, asceticism probably came into the Church from the East at least as early as the fourth century. Nor was the Greece of classical days composed entirely of volatile, laughter-loving people. There were Cynics and Stoics, as well as Epicureans and Cyrenaics.

There was much Puritanism "in the highest places"[2] during the crowning period of the pre-Reformation Church. Predestination was inherited for mediaeval orthodoxy.[2] There were Jansenists in the seventeenth century, by the way, as well as Jesuits. In "assurance of salvation" the friars rivalled any Calvinist. The ordinary conscientious Franciscan, moreover, retained very little of St. Francis's joy in life.[3] Even G. K. Chesterton compares the atmosphere that preceded and surrounded St. Francis to a black cave and a howling wilderness, a world without stars or flowers.[4]

We are all too prone, likewise, to assume that worship in the Middle Ages was invariably like that which we are now accustomed to see on the Continent As a matter of fact the early friars were often Puritanical in the plainness of their services. Many of their first settlements had no chapel, no singing, and often not even an oratory. Many of them worshipped in a solitude and a contemplation which seldom needed outward forms. Conrad Offida found that when he became a priest and sung Mass he lost in spiritual consolation. It was often

[1] See above p. 66.
[2] Coulton, p. 11.
[3] Ibid., p. 3.
[4] G.K.C., p. 31.

felt that the highest religion was least dependent on beautiful sights and sounds. The parish church of the thirteenth century was often bare in ornament.[1]

In fact, Catholicism, with its penances and fastings, and mortal sins, can be as gloomy as Calvinism if one takes it as seriously as the Puritans took their religion. Protestants have always acknowledged that one may lead the most religious life in the most secular callings. The Roman Church does not admit this fully and ungrudgingly.[2] With Her the ascetic ideal is *the* Ideal.

The doctrine of the Priesthood of Believers, as worked out in evangelical thought, implies that the whole life of the believer should be "an offering well-pleasing to God."[3] The priesthood of the laity means that the idea of holiness and consecration is carried into everything. There is no moral superiority in the celibate life, or in monastic withdrawal from the world. The doctrine of Salvation by Faith, only, put a stop to all devices for winning Heaven or escaping Hell by self-torture.[4] At the heart of the conception of the Church which Christ has taught us is the spirit of service.[5] We need to realise in new ways the inherent priesthood of the Christian people.[6] through which the secular vanishes, because everything has become sacred. Business and pleasure are lifted to the level of sanctification, for we are priests unto God.[7]

[1] Coulton, p. 11.
[2] See above, p. 66.
[3] Ryder, p. 50.
[4] Rashdall, pp. 214, 215.
[5] Ryder, p. vii
[6] Report of the Conference of Bishops (1908), quoted by Ryder, p. vii.
[7] Oman, p. 5. See also Rashdall, p. 210.

This was the ideal which was the backbone of Puritanism. The Puritans were men whose minds had derived a peculiar character from daily contemplation of superior beings and eternal interests. They habitually ascribed every event to an overruling Providence. The very meanest of them was one to whose fate a mysterious and terrible importance belonged, one upon whose slightest action the Spirits of Light and Darkness looked with anxious interest. He had been destined before Heaven and Earth were created to enjoy a felicity which would continue when Heaven and Earth had passed away. For his sake empires had flourished and decayed. He had been wrested by no common Deliverer from the grasp of no common Foe. He had been ransomed by the sweat of no vulgar agony, by the blood of no earthly Sacrifice. It was for him that the sun had been darkened, that the rocks had been rent, that the dead had risen, that all nature had shuddered at the sufferings of her expiring God.

Thus the Puritan had two sides to his character: the one all self-abasement, penitence, gratitude, passion; the other proud, calm, inflexible, sagacious. He prostrated himself in the dust before his Maker: but he set his foot on the neck of his king.

People who saw nothing of the godly, but their uncouth visages, and heard nothing but their groans and their whining hymns, might laugh at them; but those had little reason to laugh who encountered them in the hall of debate or on the field of battle. These fanatics brought to civil and military affairs a coolness of judgment and an immutability of

purpose which some writers have thought inconsistent with their religious zeal, but which were in fact its consequences. It was the intensity of their feelings on one subject which made them tranquil on every other. One overpowering sentiment had brought into subjection pity and hatred, ambition and fear. Death had lost its terrors, and pleasure its charms. Enthusiasm had cleared their minds from every vulgar fashion. It might sometimes lead them to pursue unwise ends, but never to choose unwise means.

So the Puritans are described by Macaulay.[1] Such they seem to have been in the hour of their triumph. They went through the world, crushing and trampling down oppressors; mingling with human beings but having neither part nor lot in human infirmities; insensible to fatigue, to pleasure, and to pain; not to be pierced by any weapon; not to be withstood by any barrier.[1] What were they like in later generations? Looked at broadly, they appear to have been a pious people, long-headed, thrifty, industrious; feet planted firmly upon the earth; with a conscientious feeling that the worldly virtues are necessary, and that without honesty no other excellence, religious or moral, was worth anything. That is how they are represented by Froude,[2]—during the week; and at the end of the week, as he says, there was the *Cotter's Saturday Night*, when

> The Cheerfu' supper done, wi' serious face
> They round the ingle form a circle wide;

and

> The sire turns o'er, wi' patriarchal grace,
> The big ha' bible, ance his father's pride.

[1] Macaulay's *Essay on Milton*. [2] Froude, pp. 148, 149.

The priest-like father reads the sacred page; then kneeling down to Heaven's Eternal King

The saint, the father, and the husband prays.

They were a great race. When Burns says that it is

From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs,
That makes her loved at home, revered abroad;

we may think him a little rhetorical, but if we recall the Huguenots, the Dutch, the English Nonconformists, the Scots, the New England States, it is difficult to avoid the impression that Calvinism and sound business are in some way connected. There appears to be some foundation for such an opinion. Max Weber after a good deal of labour has declared "that Capitalism flourishes best on Calvinistic soil."[1] And Ernst Tröeltsch, another celebrated student of the question, declares that in his opinion Max Weber has "completely proved his case."[2]

That is one side of the question. There is another. In the Middle Ages these two conceptions of the Church, the material ideal and the spiritual ideal, were never harmonised.[3] It fell to Luther to emphasise the conception of an Invisible Church, a fellowship with God independent of all outward organisation. The Effect of this on Ideals of Life and Conduct have been, on the whole, as described above. It is, however, usual nowadays to emphasise another point of view. This doctrine of the Priesthood of Believers and its corollary of the Invisible Church has led to innumerable variations of eccle-

[1] Troëltsch, p. 134. [2] Ibid., p. 138. [3] Lindsay, p. 481.

siastical organisation. This was so from the first. It was not long before Hooker was able to say of the Reformers at Geneva that for spiritual government they had no laws at all agreed upon, but did what the pastors of their souls by persuasion could win them unto.[1] Every particular church did that within itself which some few of their own thought good, by whom the rest were all directed. Every later sect endeavoured to be certain degrees more removed from conformity with Rome than the rest before had been.[2]

Now this state of things is by many felt to be unfortunate. It is a common-place that the cause of Christ is weakened by our religious dissensions.[3] Every day, says Canon Streeter, it is becoming clearer that the work of the Church of Christ will never be accomplished without re-union.[4] As a matter of fact the process has already begun. We have the United Church of Southern India, the United Methodist Church, the United Free Church of Scotland, and quite recently, in Canada, the union of Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians.

Now, no doubt, this is all to the good. I have no desire to give the impression that such movements are not advantageous. But there is a tendency to exalt unity into a fetich. To some extent we are deluded by the glamour of rhetorical phrases. We hear of the seamless robe of Christ that has been rent. We think of the Holy Catholic Church of earlier times and then recall the present position,

[1] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, p. 80.
[2] Ibid., p. 81.
[3] Gore, p. 340.
[4] B. H. Streeter, p. 189.

when with a scornful wonder men see Her sore oppressed,

By schisms rent asunder:
By heresies distressed.

But one can easily be carried away by poetry. There are other considerations. In connection with these varieties of religious experience it may well be that so far as they are alive and vigorous each pushes forward. The withered branches break off. So says Father Tyrrell; and even goes so far as to maintain that the tendency towards re-union is the result of weariness and decay.[1]

I would not like to go so far as this; but it does seem desirable to remember that although the mass formation in which the Roman Catholic Church advances may be good, there are conditions in which it is necessary to attack in extended order. There is such a thing as guerilla warfare. Anyhow, it often seems as if even the Roman Church flourishes most when exposed to the competition of other Churches.[2] As we shall show later, too, infidelity appears to thrive best in countries where there is only one form of ecclesiastical organisation.[2] It is even feared by some that the words of Voltaire are still true, "If there were one religion in England, its despotism would be terrible."[3]

Nor must it be too readily assumed that because people are collected into one Church that we are bound to have unity. For example, there were Jesuits and Jansenists. To-day we have the Anglo-Catholics. Islam contains several sects. We all

[1] Tyrrell, p. 223.
[2] See below, pp. 77, 78, and 81.
[3] *Lettres Anglaises.*

know of Shiah and Sunni. The Suffis are also well known. In the Jewish Church there were Pharisees and Sadducees. Hinduism is essentially eclectic. Bishop Whitehead's scholarly work on the *Village Gods of Southern India* shows that nearly every village has its local deity, with which its neighbours have no concern. As for Buddhism, it is confined to Eastern Asia, and is in fact "only a religion of the clergy."[1]

Nor should it be supposed that schism was unknown to Christianity before the Reformation. Even in apostolic times there were those who said that they were of Paul, or of Apollos, or of Cephas.[2] To-day we have Unitarians, Theosophists, Christian Scientists, Primitive Methodists. In earlier days there were Arians, Gnostics, Manichaeans, Montanists. The Evangelical Free Churches are no further apart than are the Coptic, Chaldean, Syrian, Greek and Armenian Churches. Nor was the Church of the West in the Middle Ages free from schism, for heresy is schism. Albigenses, Hussites, Lollards, Fraticelli: their name is legion.[3]

Roman Catholics, however, lay the blame upon Protestantism for modern infidelity. The charge is sanctioned by several Papal Encyclicals; and the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* airily refers to the complete unbelief which necessarily follows from Protestantism.[4] Now it is certainly true that the despairing sense of sin so widespread in the Middle Ages, the

[1] Döllinger, p. 37.
[2] 1 Cor., 12.
[3] See Turberville's *Mediaeval Heresy*, especially pp. 48–52, 80–84, 107–111. Robertson, p. 406. And even Janssen, p. 569.
[4] *Cath. Ency.*, Art. Ref., p. 710.

sense of a great world-suffering imposed on us as a punishment, has almost vanished. Where it persists it is mainly as pessimism. The conception is no longer able to produce or sustain a Church-directed civilisation. Life to come is no longer the dominant motive. The tendency is rather to limit one's interests to the present world. Mundane concerns have acquired enhanced value.[1]

It does not seem an exaggeration to say that nearly all our progress in science, politics, philosophy and religion is the result of the overthrow of that hierarchic, world-dominating institution known as the Papacy. But for the Reformation there would have been very little progress.[2] The Inquisition, both Spanish and Roman, would have seen to that.[3] Giant States, however, have shattered the dream of ecclesiastical world-empire. In its place is the idea of "absolute personality," which permeates our whole world, and has its influence even where denied.[4] This has meant a liberation of the most tremendous forces and possibilities; but it has also involved the disruptive effects of a new ideal.[5] There are, nevertheless, some who would say that infidelity and revolution have been seen in their worst forms chiefly in Catholic countries, where revolution is a chronic disease.[6] It seems as if by its excess of supernaturalism, Catholicism provokes infidelity in cultivated minds.

[1] Troëltsch, pp. 21–25. See also pp. 26–29, *passim*.
[2] Von Hügel, p. 245.
[3] *Cam. His.*, Vol. III, p. 33.
[4] Troëltsch, pp. 36, 37. *Cam. His.*, Vol. III, p. 9.
[5] Ibid., pp. 26 and 29.
[6] Schaffe, p. 28. Fairbairn, p. 60.

This was true of the period before the Reformation, when theology was almost apologetic in the presence of philosophic atheism. The denunciation was half-hearted.[1] It was an age which threatened to undermine the foundations of the Christian faith. In the schools of Italy, the immortality of the soul was openly disputed: and the discussion shocked only a few.[1] It is, perhaps, not too much to say that the Reformation checked the scepticism of the Renaissance;[2] and of the thirteenth century, even a Roman Catholic historian has said that we can neither conceive nor imagine such a time.[3]

It is worth noting that, in the eighteenth century, Deism in England was "a poor and vapid thing," compared with that of France. In spite of Hume, Gibbon, and Tom Paine, the apologists triumphed. At the end of the century, the Christian religion was more strongly entrenched in the reason and heart of the English people than at the beginning. In France, on the other hand, the century began with a Church illustrious in intellect, learning, and eloquence. It was the age of Louis XIV. The century closed with the French Revolution, in which king and Church perished. In England the victory was with the apologists: in France, with the sceptics. With us, Deism was outmatched.[4] Abroad it had the intellectual superiority.[5]

The fact is that many people are dazzled by the

[1] Creighton, pp. 219–222.
[2] Schaffe, p. 28.
[3] Barry's *Papal Monarchy*, quoted by Coulton in *Mediaeval Studies*.
[4] Fairbairn, pp. 63–66. In fair argument Religion won easily.
[5] Ibid., pp. 67, 68. In France the Church never had a chance.

glamour of the Middle Ages and the Mediaeval Church. Men, moreover, are nowadays so possessed and oppressed by the labour needed to win a livelihood that they have not the energy to weigh or to master the deeper mysteries of life. They are prepared either to allow authority to affirm, or to let criticism dissolve their belief. In such an age, it is clear, that Roman Catholicism may have its place and make its converts; but not in and through it is religion to be realised in an age of thought, and a world of freedom, progress, order and activity.[1] The fidelity of the Roman Church to the letter, her refusal to admit the symbolic nature of the Apocalyptic Vision, has gradually weakened her influence and brought her into conflict with the modern mind.[2]

Infallibility, authority, matchless organisation, rigorous discipline, and jealously guarded education are unable to suppress the critical and sceptical spirit of the laity.[3] In fact many of the virtues of the modern Roman Church appear to be due to competition with those other denominations which its hierarchy despises. Unchecked Romanism has failed.[4] Nowhere is the Roman Church so free from scandal, and so effective for good, as where it is closely surrounded and jealously scrutinised by bodies of Christians which it recognises only as heretics.[5] Nor can this be explained merely by the competition;

[1] Fairbairn, pp. 203, 204.
[2] Tyrrell, pp. 213, 214.
[3] Or even, as certain flagrant cases have proved, to keep it from the clergy.
[4] Coulton, p. 105.
[5] Bacon, p. 323.

because where Protestantism does not exist, Rome has to face the still more bitter opposition of Agnostic anti-clericalism.[1] There is probably no country where unbelief is so strong and so vindictive as in France. The anti-clericals of the nineteenth century are more extreme than were the Encyclopaedists.[2] The Italians, likewise, in spite of a strong attachment to the externals of Romanism, have no faith in Christianity as a moral system. Their fanaticism and scepticism, their superstition and irreligion, are proof of the decline of the Papacy.[3]

Hence it seems rash to lay the blame for infidelity, or for schism, entirely upon the Reformation. Of course, inasmuch as the breach with Rome has produced religious toleration,—and we propose to show later on that the two were connected,—to that extent the Reformation is responsible for the present varieties of Christianity in the West. Until the power of Rome was broken, heresy had a poor chance of surviving. On the other hand, it does seem as if religion is such a personal matter that uniformity is unnatural. As the homely proverb has it, "one man's meat is another man's poison."

This is not the place to elaborate these arguments. Before concluding this consideration of the effects of the theory of the priesthood of the laity upon Ideals of Life and Conduct, there is just one more point I should like to mention. It is widely held that the "Lutheran and Anglican reduction of the Church to a department of the State is a sorry

[1] Streeter, pp. 153–157, and see below p. 109.
[2] Fairbairn, p. 69.
[3] Ditchfield, *The Church in Italy*, p. 477.

dereliction of an essential attribute of the development of religion."[1] Established Christianity, it is said, which claims to embrace the whole community, which it costs nothing to profess, into which children are baptised practically as a matter of course, is as audacious a departure from the method of Christ as can well be conceived.[2]

In passing, I would merely like to point out that Our Lord Himself was brought up in a national church, which He never left, and which He seems to have loved. More important, perhaps, is the practical question of whether the existence in our country, to-day, of an Anglican establishment is inconsistent with the actual state of beliefs in the nation, and is, accordingly, a real disadvantage to religion on the whole.[3] In short, has the Protestant theory lent itself "to an exaggerated nationalism," which has led to Erastianism, and a mischievous disunion, so that the Church is paralysed as an instrument for the conversion of the world?[4]

It will be impossible here to discuss the relation of reunion to foreign missions. The "mischievous disunion" has already been considered above. As for Erastianism, so far as we in England are concerned, the objections appear to be theoretical rather than practical. The opponent would not have much difficulty in scoring points at a debating society. *But* the system does work pretty well. It is very doubtful whether a change would be for the better.

[1] Von Hügel, p. 245.
[2] Gore, p. 348.
[3] Ibid., p. 357.
[4] W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World, etc.*, p. 260.

The "exaggerated nationalism" is a more important point. Civilisation is becoming cosmopolitan. "Nationalism" does rather imply insularity,[1] and the modern world has little use for local and national versions of universal truths; so that it is becoming increasingly difficult to vindicate a conception of Christianity which is national.[2] Even this, however, is fast becoming an antiquated argument; for the tendency in the mission field is to foster native churches constructed on national lines.

Anyhow, the national church was inevitable if there was to be any progress in Europe, as we shall now make clear.

[1] W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World, etc.*, p. 260.
[2] Henson, p. xiv.

III
The World

III

Separation of State from Church.

THE central and significant fact of the Reformation is that princes acted on Luther's theory that the State had power over the Church. Before the burning of the canon law by Luther in 1520 no prince had openly and permanently cast off his allegiance to the international ecclesiastical state of which Rome was the head. This ecclesiastical system was the practical result of dogma, and the overthrow of dogma was the only way to obtain permanent relief from the intolerable abuses of that system.[1] The origin of the whole movement was an attempt to secure emancipation from clerical tutelage, i.e., domination, and an effort to remedy abuses which were the inevitable outcome of the authority of the Church.[2]

Even Luther, in his *Address to the German Nobility*, scarcely adverts to religious matters at all. He attacks the Church as the source of worldly disorder. The Diet of Worms (1521) not only condemned Luther's heresy, but also solemnly formulated a comprehensive indictment against the Roman Church.

This is not surprising, if one considers what the Church of the West was in the Middle Ages. It was a State. And it was international. Its economic influence was almost incalculable because of its vast

[1] Lea, *Cam. His.*, Vol. I, p. 653.
[2] Pollard, *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, p. 147. Grisar, Vol. VI, p. 401.

property, its widespread and unscrupulous system of taxation, and its encouragement of monasticism. It dominated the intellectual, and profoundly affected the social interests of Europe.[1] In order properly to appreciate the Effects of the Reformation on the Ideals of Life and Conduct one must make some attempt to appreciate what in those days was meant by the Church. Otherwise it is very little use for people to tell us that the Reformation freed us from the tyranny of the Papacy.

The old illustration of a pyramid is useful. The feudal system has been compared to a pyramid, and one used to work upwards in imagination, from villeins, through gradations, to tenants-in-chief, to princes and kings, up to the emperor. He was the apex. Similarly there was the clerical pyramid. Priests and canons, archdeacons, bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and, at the apex, the Pope. *If* the question had been raised whether Pope or emperor was at the top, the answer would have been that the emperor was lord over men's bodies, but that the Pope was sovereign of their souls. Therefore obviously, for souls are more important than bodies, the highest of all was the Pope.

In order to assist the imagination one might recall illustrations of this from practical politics. One emperor held the stirrup for Gregory VII to mount his mule. Another, Henry IV, stood barefooted in the snow outside the wall of the town, waiting to be pardoned by the Pope. Our own English Henry II walked barefoot through the streets of Canterbury and knelt in the chapter house

[1] E. B., Art., Reformation.

for the monks to flog him. Canossa and Canterbury help to bring home to one the power of the Papacy. Do not suppose that it was merely religious sentiment which actuated Henry IV and Henry II. Political necessity forced them to face these humiliations. Again, we may recollect that the Church was an *imperium in imperio*. Religious Orders were practically independent: amenable only to the Pope and to their own superiors. The king could not send a commissioner to inspect a monastery, nor could he arrest a criminal who had sought sanctuary. Archbishops and bishops had no authority within the gate of a Benedictine or Dominican Abbey.

From the throne downwards every secular office was dependent on the Church. No king was a lawful sovereign till the representative of the Pope placed the crown upon his head. Since 800 A.D., when Charlemagne received the crown of the Empire from the Pope, even the Empire had been in the gift of the Papacy. And what the Church bestowed the Church claimed to take away. Bulls of deposition were not at all infrequent.[1]

The disposition of property, moreover, was in the hands of the clergy. No will could be proved except before the bishop or his officer. No will was valid if the testator died out of Communion. Bishops' commissaries sat in town and city taking cognisance of the moral conduct of every man and woman. Offences against life and property might be tried by the common law, but ecclesiastical courts dealt with sins. If a man was a profligate or a drunkard; if he lied or swore; if he did not come to Communion; if

[1] E.g., King John, Elizabeth.

a tradesman used false weights or measures;—the eye of the parish priest was everywhere, and ecclesiastical courts were always open to examine and to punish. This tremendous power existed generally throughout the west of Europe down to the eve of the Reformation.

While the clergy governed the laity, the laity had no power over them. If a priest committed a crime, he claimed Benefit of Clergy. The civil power could not touch him. He was reserved for the Ordinary. We all know the trouble Henry II had over this.

Such power required from the clergy the highest wisdom and the highest probity. Imagine the result when the clergy were not only men who came below the highest standard of integrity, but who were corrupt. The bishops' courts, for example, could be made the instrument of most detestable extortion. When a layman offended, the only object was to make him pay. The remarks Chaucer puts into the mouth of the pardoner show what people in the fourteenth century thought about it. Money, not charity, covered the multitude of sins.

If a man spoke disrespectfully of the clergy, he was fined. If he refused to pay, he was excommunicated. That meant that no shopkeeper might sell him food or clothes, no friend might relieve him, no voice might address him; and if he died unreconciled, he was refused Christian burial.[1]

It seemed necessary to revert to these well-known facts in order to realise the significance of the statement that as a result of the Reformation the Church has ceased to trespass on secular territory. This

[1] Froude, pp. 44–51.

revolt against clerical authority was one of the most permanent and universally successful movements of modern times. It has pervaded Catholic countries as well as Protestant. All over the world the State has completely deposed the Church from the position it held in the Middle Ages. Privileges, authority, immunity, all have gone. No ecclesiastic has now any appeal from the law of the land in which he lives. To-day there is not a clerical prime minister anywhere. Roughly speaking this is the main issue of the Reformation. And it has been practically universal.[1]

This revolution in society was not immediate. For generations European civilisation had rested on the absolute authority of the State and the absolute authority of the Church. Everybody had to obey. This was true in Protestant as well as in Catholic countries. Not more than one religion was permitted. Everybody had to attend divine service on Sunday, to receive Communion, and to fast: to be married, buried, and baptised by the clergy. In Catholic countries, also, everyone had to go to Confession.[2] Yet to many people the thought of a return to the Middle Ages has a great attraction. As everyone knows, in art and literature, not only in England, but on the Continent, there have been movements based to some extent upon a glorification of things mediaeval. This was an element in Romanticism. It was evident among the Pre-Raphaelites. In the religious world the Oxford Movement revealed a similar tendency.[3]

[1] Pollard, *Cam. His.*, Vol. II, p. 147.
[2] Seignobos, pp. 63, 64.
[3] Storr, p. 126. J. M. Robertson, *History of Free Thought*, p. 444, Vol. II.

The Middle Ages were, in some respects, times when the greatness of the Church in the West was evident. Civilisation, nowadays, rests upon the "diversities of national States"; but there was a time when Western civilisation was based upon the unity of Christendom. Symbolically this system was represented by the universal sway of emperor and Pope. It was founded on fact, too; on the geographical and climatic sameness of the Mediterranean area; on the spiritual unity of mankind proclaimed by the Christian faith; on the memories and remains of the world-wide culture of Rome.

Mediaeval kings had a duty to Christendom which transcended their duty to their own dominions. Mediaeval society was divided primarily not into nations but into occupational groups, which had little or no relation to the divisions of kingdoms. The position and power of such groups depended partly on the duties they performed for humanity. Monasteries were not only for monks, but the service of humanity by prayer. Guilds were not merely to regulate trade and to obtain good conditions for the workers; they existed also for the Christian purpose of selling honest goods.[1]

The revolution, as we have said, was not immediate: nor was the conception on which it was based altogether a novelty. As early as the Norman Conquest there had been friction between the monarch and the clergy. William the Conqueror took a strong line in his opposition to Papal supremacy, provided in fact a very good precedent for Henry VIII Henry I carried on the struggle.

[1] Benians, pp. ix–xi.

His controversy with Anselm is known to all. It is not, though, quite so well known that he was acting merely in keeping with a spirit that was springing up all over Europe. Pope and emperor had a similar difficulty. It was settled in 1122 by the Concordat of Worms. The immunity of the clergy from the control of the king's courts was another grievance. It led to the quarrel between Henry II and Becket. Papal taxation caused frequent outbursts of indignation. Annates and Peter's Pence were perhaps particularly galling. Edward I successfully resisted the Bull Clericis Laicos, as everybody knows. Provisors caused a lot of trouble, for instance in the reign of Henry III. These things are well known, and are merely mentioned to indicate the reason why it would be wrong to regard the Reformation as completely responsible for the overthrow of Papal dominion. The Reformation was, nevertheless, a conspicuous phase in the gradual decline of the majestic mediaeval ecclesiastical State.[1]

Amongst the immediate results of the revolt was the seizure by more than one monarch of the property of monasteries, and the appropriation of ecclesiastical foundations. Henceforth the State begins not only to disregard canon law, but to legislate for its clergy. All this, and more, was the result of Luther's new conception, the conception of an invisible Church.[1] Not, of course, that statesmen were moved by the doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers. The Reformation was, however, a popular movement. Luther was one of those men

[1] E. B., Art., Reformation.
[2] Oman, *The Church and the Divine Order*, p. 192.

who could appeal to the people.[1] Statesmen were thus able to take advantage of the new movement and of the spirit of nationality.

It may be as well before going any further to clear up an apparent contradiction in what we have been saying. At first we spoke of the Reformation as if it were primarily and essentially religious: now we are talking as if it was mainly political. And it is not unusual, to-day, to describe the Reformation as the religious and political revolt of the sixteenth century which led to the overthrow of the secular power of the Church.[2] Some would even dismiss the religious changes as incidental, and assert that they were not the object sought, but the means of attaining the object.[3] This, however, is going too far. The truth is that it is almost impossible to distinguish, even in thought, the secular and religious elements involved. They are bewilderingly interwoven, and, in practice, were never separated. Hence they are constantly mistaken one for the other.[3]

So much depends upon one's point of view. The Reformation is often considered to be chiefly economic, both in its origin and its effects. Even when it is admitted to have been the culmination, or explosion, of certain intellectual, social and political forces which had been at work throughout Christendom for centuries before, it is still necessary to acknowledge that the credit of bringing the various forces "to a head" doubtless remains with Luther.[4]

[1] Grisar, Vol VI, p. 401.
[2] E. B., Art., Reformation.
[3] *Cam. His.*, Vol. I, p. 653.
[4] J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought*, pp. 404–406.

There is, however, undoubtedly a feeling amongst modern historians to emphasise the fact that Luther could have done little without the nobles who supported him from economic motives.[1] Consequently it is becoming usual to emphasise the economic effects of the Reformation.

To resume. The policy of the Church of the West in the Middle Ages was based on the belief that the spiritual welfare mattered more than the temporal. Consequently its warfare was frequently waged with a deep, concentrated, and steadfast determination, with an intense devotion, with a self-sacrificing and all-consuming zeal which is probably without any parallel on so great a scale in human history.[2] Having done its work in moralising the pagan world, however, it degenerated into a kind of paganism itself. Men and women prayed for all kinds of personal favours and hung offerings on the shrines of the Virgin and the Saints, just as centuries ago they had done before the shrines of Venus, of Juno and of Jove.[3] Consequently the great fabric had no sooner been constructed than a spirit of rebellion appeared, and men began, careless of consequences, to destroy all that their fathers had created.[4]

If the mediaeval system had not been overthrown, the life would have gone out of it; for it was no longer an inspiration of thought and action, but a dead weight which would have destroyed all initiative and spontaneity.[4] Thus the conviction spread

[1] J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought*, pp. 404–406.
[2] Kidd, p. 305.
[3] Crozier, p. 29.
[4] Carter, pp. 105, 106.

throughout our Western world that the doctrine which had raised the Church into a world power, co-extensive with the State, had led to the main principle of progress becoming obscured, and almost obliterated.[1]

The Reformation tried to substitute the sense of individual responsibility for the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. By so doing it challenged "the very principle of life around which the Church had come to be organised."[2] This idea of individual responsibility seems to have been the inspiration of the Reformers. The principle behind the Reformation was that knowledge of God was direct and personal.[3] What is this but saying that we are justified by faith alone?

It is accordingly upon theological concepts that the Reformers concentrated throughout the stress of the sixteenth century: the insufficiency of human nature, the incapacity of the natural man for good, Justification by Faith as opposed to the prevailing doctrine of Justification by Works are met with continually in all the fierce controversies of the period.[1] Individual responsibility. That is the key-note of much that is to follow: religious toleration, political liberty, freedom of thought; for the Reformation was, however unconsciously, a very effectual assertion of human liberty. With an audacity we are now hardly able to appreciate, the Reformers took their religious life into their own hands. They broke the overwhelming might of a

[1] Kidd, p. 299.
[2] Ibid., p. 302.
[3] Gwatkin, *Hast. Ency.*, Art., Reformation.

Church that allows no opposition. The sects which they could not put down proved how real was the liberating power of the Reformation.[1]

The struggle for faith and freedom that we must now consider is one where both parties believed whole-heartedly in intolerance. There is perhaps nothing in history to equal in atrocity the Massacre on St. Bartholomew's Night; yet not even this was able to awaken the thought of toleration in the victims, so deeply was the exclusive, implacable Calvinism implanted.[2] The persecuted Huguenots were fanatically hostile to any idea of religious liberty.[3] They used to endeavour, wherever they might succeed in gaining the upperhand, to suppress the faintest signs of dissent.[1] Swiss, Scottish, Belgian, Saxon Confessions assert the duty of magistrates to punish heresy.[4] To men like the Reformers, men of Catholic training, the toleration of error would have seemed illogical, frivolous and harmful.

Heresy was persecuted because it was dangerous to society, and intolerance was the result not only of ecclesiastical authority, but of public opinion.[5] In those days men killed a heretic as they would set a foot upon a noxious insect. Luther was surprisingly moderate. Although he unhesitatingly identified truth with his own opinions, his intolerance spent itself chiefly in violent language. In 1528 he wrote

[1] Oman, p. 148.
[2] Ruffini, p. 114.
[3] Ibid., p. 340, and *passim*.
[4] Ibid., pp. 87, 88. He quotes both Gurieu and Bossuet. Lecky, Vol. II, p. 43, note 1.
[5] Turberville, p. vi.

that it was not right that such people[1] should be slain, burned, cruelly put to death. Everyone should be allowed to believe what he would.

Nevertheless, although the men of the Reformation had no sympathy with toleration, it was from the principles which they enunciated, that at the opportune moment and in more favourable circumstances, religious liberty was able to make a triumphant appearance.[2] These principles were a sort of leaven which coming into contact with the theories of the Italian humanists produced a wonderful fermentation. By itself humanism was feeble where religion was concerned. Whoever considers the daring heights to which their speculation rose and its fearless progress to the logical consequences of its premises will marvel that the movement "had no repercussion on dogma." They kept the two provinces, that of reason and that of faith, absolutely separate. As philosophers they indulged in the most daring scepticism. As Catholics they submitted to the Church.[3]

The futility of humanism is illustrated in the life of Servetus, in whom there was the best of everything that came to maturity in the sixteenth century,—except what resulted from the evangelical Reformation. He exerted no permanent influence. Probably, no doubt, this was because of the action of Calvin. In defence of the burning of Servetus, however, it may be said that the most prominent Anti-trinitarians had no discernment of Luther's

[1] Viz., the Antinomians. Grisar, Vol. V, p. 19.
[2] Ruffini, p. 59.
[3] Ibid., pp. 59, 60. Harnack, p. 120.

and Zwingli's conception of faith. They were satisfied with morality and illuminism. Toleration of them at that time would probably have meant the dissolution of the evangelical belief.[1] Erasmus provides another example of the barrenness of pure humanism.

Perhaps these statements are too sweeping, but at least it may be maintained that, but for Protestantism, humanism would never have been pushed into the arena.[2] On the other hand, humanism brought into the Reformation a liberal philosophy and a spirit of toleration. Religious liberty was nowhere vigorously advocated until refugees from Italy, banished because of their religion, drifted into the great current of Protestantism.[3] To Socinianism alone belongs the glory of having determined more or less immediately all the efforts to obtain religious liberty. A hundred and fifty years before the other evangelical Churches, the Socinians adopted this principle. It was advocated among the earliest Anabaptists to some extent, but the explicit assertion of freedom of conscience did not become a part of their constitution until the arrival of Arminius; and Arminianism was strongly impregnated with Socinianism.[4]

The oldest known writings against religious persecution were attributed by his contemporaries to Socinus. Castellion is given the glory of being the most courageous champion of toleration in the

[1] Harnack, pp. 127–134.
[2] Ruffini, p. 61. Note, however, the part played by Erasmus in the Ordinances of Basle, 1527.
[3] Ibid., p. 61.
[4] Ibid., pp. 88–90.

sixteenth century. His warm invective against fire and torture[1] is in striking contrast to Theodore Beza's famous apology for intolerance, and to Calvin's defence of the burning of Servetus.[2] Cardinal Morone, nevertheless, was kept in prison by the Holy Office for a long period because suspected of frequenting the company of heretics. He figures prominently in Bernardino Ochino's *Dialogues* advocating toleration.[3] Another of the little band who were opposed to the punishment of heretics was Aconcio.[4]

All these were men of the sixteenth century. It was not until 1604 that there appeared the great *Socinian Catechism of Rakau*. There are two prefaces, one Latin and the other German. Both belong to the epoch when the Socinian Church had already been strongly influenced from without. The Latin preface shows traces of Arminianism; while the preface to the German edition is related to the work of Luther, and places the Socinian Catechism among the results of the Reformation.[5]

In 1611, appeared the *Catechism of the Arminian Baptists* in Holland. It also includes the principle of religious liberty. As we have said, Arminianism was considerably influenced by the Sozzini.

From Holland, Socinianism migrated during the seventeenth century to England; and with them came the doctrine of religious toleration.[6] Shortly

[1] In his Latin Bible, 1551.
[2] Ruffini, p. 78.
[3] Ochino was a Capuchin.
[4] His *De Stratagematis Satanane* appeared in 1565.
[5] Harnack, pp. 118, 119.
[6] Ruffini, pp. 86–88.

after the arrival in 1611 of Arminian Baptists from Holland, there issued from their midst what is probably the very first book published in the English language, in England, advocating liberty of conscience.[1]

In 1636, appeared *The Tractate on Schism* by John Hales, which shows Racovian influence. *The Judgment of the Religion of Protestants*, by Chillingworth (1637), is also indebted to Socinianism, and quotes Aconcio.

Only the Baptists were willing to accept this principle of toleration, at first, of all the dissenting sects in England. Anabaptists, Brownists, Congregationalists, Independents, whatever we call them, were all hostile to the idea. It was painfully, and solely by contact[2] with Socinians and Arminians that they changed.[3] During the Civil War, persecutor and persecuted were equally intolerant. Nothing was further from the thoughts of Presbyterians than religious liberty. One of them remarked that if the devil were given the choice of re-establishing Episcopacy or of granting toleration, he would choose the latter. Another said that he would rather find himself buried in the grave than live to see this intolerable toleration.

It was the Independents under Cromwell who did all in their power to introduce liberty of worship

[1] Leonard Busher's *Religious Peace, or a Plea for Liberty of Conscience*, which appeared in 1614. The *Areopagitica* was not published until 1644, and Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying* until 1647.

[2] Ruffini, p. 157. Masson, Vol. III, p. 101.

[3] Socinians and Arminians, whom they met during exile in Holland.

into the law of the land. As early as 1647 they obtained full liberty for all except Catholics and Prelatists,[1] provided no attempt was made to offend morality or disturb public order; but Parliament soon undid their work by introducing a Bill to punish not only Papists and Prelatists, but also atheists, blasphemers, heretics, and all who impugned the fundamental truths of the Christian religion. Cromwell dissolved the Parliament and reproached it for hostility to toleration.[2]

With the Restoration everything was changed. The Clarendon Code was introduced. Nevertheless in 1677 the power of consigning heretics to death was withdrawn from the Church.[3] In 1680, too, a Bill to relieve Protestant Dissenters from the penalties of the 35th of Elizabeth, the most severe act in force against them, having passed both Houses was lost from the table of the House of Lords at the moment that the King came to give his assent.[4]

Meanwhile the nonconformist ministers and their followers were experiencing a harassing persecution under the various penal laws in force against them; judges and magistrates crowding the gaols with the pious confessors of Puritanism.[5] It was not until 1689 that the famous Toleration Act gave relief to Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Quakers. Although it has been called an Act of religious intolerance for Socinians and Roman

[1] i.e. Members of the Church of England.
[2] Ruffini, pp. 183, 184.
[3] Lecky, p. 29.
[4] An artifice by which Charles evaded the odium of a refusal. Hallam, p. 722.
[5] Hallam, p. 722.

Catholics,[1] it is justly hailed by Hallam and Lecky as the Magna Charta of religious liberty in England.

To what extent may this victory be regarded as one of the Effects of the Reformation on the Ideals of Life and Conduct? From the theological side, the impulse came through Socinianism. Now the faith of Sozzini was very different from the Evangelical. The Italian Reformer knew nothing of Justification by Faith, as enunciated by Luther.[2] It has been said that Anti-trinitarianism and Socinianism indicate the destruction of Catholicism which could be effected by a combination of Scholasticism and the Renaissance without any religious fervour. In this movement the new epoch and the Middle Ages stretch forth hands to each other across the Reformation.[3]

On the theological side the impulse came from Socinianism. Politically it came rather from the rise of dissenting bodies. Right from the beginning there was a struggle for predominance between Lutherans and Calvinists. The confusion increased as other denominations arose.[4] Religious liberty became a feature of practical politics because of the bitter strife among the jarring sects.[5] It has even been said that the enthusiasm and violence of the dissenting bodies in the seventeenth century was the most potent agency ever brought to bear on democratic history.[6] The era was one of religious far more than of civil liberty;[7] but in England the two proceeded hand in hand.[8]

[1] Ruffini, p. 195.
[2] Harnack, pp. 137, 167.
[3] Ibid., p. 120.
[4] Ruffini, p.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Acton, p. 100.
[7] Hallam, *Const. His.*, Vol. II, p. 520.
[8] Acton, p. 199.

The direct political influence of the Reformation was less than has sometimes been supposed. Some States by great exertion shut out the deluge: others adroitly diverted it. Almost everywhere rulers profited by the alarm aroused by the revolution. Nations eagerly invested their rulers with every power required to preserve their faith. Before the close of the century men in France had come to understand that governments do not exist by divine right;[1] but although this truth might lead to salutary destruction, it could give little aid to progress and reform. A library of treatises was produced on the right of Roman Catholics to choose, control, and cashier their rulers. The greater part of the political ideas of Milton, Locke, and Rousseau may be found in the cumbrous Latin tomes of the Jesuits; but the work of Lessius, Molina, Mariana, and Suarez produced no lasting fruit. The permanent effect of the Reformation on democracy came through the democratic element in Presbyterianism.

It was long, however, before this element began to tell. Five years of civil war were not enough. It was not until the majority of Presbyterians had been expelled from the House of Commons that the Independents were able to force the Long Parliament to set up a republic. At the same time was adopted the idea that every congregation should govern itself. Force was no longer necessary to preserve the unity of the Church;[2] for the Church, to these Independents, was either a particular congregation, or the Invisible Church.

[1] Acton, p. 44.

[2] Ibid., p. 83.

With the Restoration, however, Cromwell's constitution was "rolled up like a scroll." Harrington and Lilburne were laughed at and forgotten; while the nation flung itself with enthusiasm at the feet of a worthless king. For some years one had to look to Holland for any real freedom of press.[1] Nevertheless, that great idea of sanctifying freedom and consecrating it to God, which teaches men to treasure the liberty of others as their own, has been the soul of what is great and good in the progress of the last two hundred years. The cause of religion, even under the influence of worldly motives, had as much as any considerations of policy to do with making this country the foremost of the free. It was the deepest current in the Revolution of 1641. It was the strongest motive that survived the reaction of 1660.[2]

This brief sketch of the growth of religious and political liberty in England seemed necessary in order to indicate the way in which we obtained toleration and political freedom. What were the causes? We have said above[3] that from the theological side the impulse came through Socinianism, and that this was not entirely a product of the Reformation. On the other hand, from the passage just quoted in the preceding paragraph, it is clear that behind Cromwell's constitution was the idea of the Priesthood of Believers. The work of the Commonwealth, however, was not permanent. The Toleration Act of 1689, on the other hand, endured. What, then, was the cause of this statute? It was the work of William III, who brought with

[1] Ruffini, pp. 48–58. [2] Acton, pp. 52, 53. [3] pp. 102, 103

him from Holland the Socinian and Arminian ideas about religious liberty. The necessity for some such legislation arose from the diversity of opinion on religious questions prevalent in England. There had been continual trouble under Charles I, during the Commonwealth, and under Charles II. The patriotic attitude of the Nonconformists, or their native shrewdness, had led them to reject the bribe offered by James II.[1] Consequently there were at least three factors at work in producing the Toleration Act. There was the urgency. Some religious settlement *must* be obtained. There was the fact that the Nonconformists had earned the gratitude of the Government. There were the preconceptions, due to Socinian and Arminian influence, of William III.

None of these factors would have existed but for the Reformation; for if the Roman Church had retained her former dominion there would have been no Nonconformists, no jarring sects, no ideal of toleration in Holland.

Was there another condition making itself felt? Lecky observes that the extraordinary thread of scepticism in England led the governing classes to regard dissent with a certain amount of indifference. The latitudinarian theology in distinguishing between fundamental and non-essential doctrine favoured this tendency.[2] This was particularly noticeable in the eighteenth century.[3] Even in Catholic countries no very active steps were taken,

[1] The Declaration of Indulgence.
[2] Ruffini, p. 191.
[3] Ibid., and Lecky, Vol. II, p. 63.

partly because the rulers themselves were affected by irreligion.[1] It was not accidental that the only tolerant form of Christianity produced at the Reformation was also conspicuously rationalist. Toleration has always been aided by changes in public opinion due to rationalism."[2]

That scepticism was prevalent at the very beginning of the eighteenth century is well known. There can be little doubt that it had been widespread at the end of the seventeenth century, when the Toleration Act was passed. The dissoluteness of the reign of Charles II has become a byeword, and there were not many years from the death of Charles to 1689. As early as 1736, Bishop Butler was writing, at the beginning of his *Analogy*, that it had come to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity was not so much as a subject of inquiry, but that it was now at length discovered to be fictitious. "And accordingly they treat it as if in the present age this were agreed among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."[3]

Hence it might be necessary to give some weight to the contention that latitudinarianism contributed largely to that public opinion which made possible an Act of Toleration. Moreover the battle was not won in 1689. There was a reaction in the reign of Queen Anne. The High Church Party came into

[1] MacCaffrey, p. 14.
[2] Ruffini, p. 191.
[3] Butler, p. xiv. See also Seignobos, p. 66.

power and managed to introduce the Occasional Conformity Act (1711), and the Schism Act (1714), which were among "the most tyrannical acts of the century."[1] It is true that they were repealed in 1719, but dissenters laboured under many disabilities until, about 1742, Walpole commenced the practice of introducing annual Indemnity Acts.

The point which I now desire to make is that the scepticism of this period owed much to Deism. The Deistic controversy, though it was brief, leads us into the very heart of eighteenth century theology. Its results lived on.[2] It may be claimed that the criticism of miracles led to the critical handling of sources. Middleton, Woolston, Hume, Voltaire and Gibbon, for example, are not so naïve in their treatment of documents and authorities as is, for instance, Montesquieu.[3] Even the conception of tracing the development of an institution, so much admired in the *Esprit des Lois*, was not unknown to Morgan. When the orthodox gave up the defence of miracles and took their stand on prophecy, their position was undermined by Collins. The separation of ethics from Christianity may well be traced to Shaftesbury and Mandeville. The belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible was seriously shaken by the Deists. Herbert of Cherbury and Tindal did much in this.[4] The Divinity of Christ was attacked, though not in so many words, nor perhaps of set purpose, by Woolston and Toland. Locke's work,

[1] Lecky, *Eighteenth Century*, Vol. I, p. 103.
[2] Storr, p. 45.
[3] Or even Macaulay, according to J. Cotter Morison's *Macaulay*, pp. 140, 141.
[4] See below, p. 117.

too, was in effect Socinian in tendency, although he denied it.

Apart from Bayle, the scepticism of the first half of the eighteenth century was mainly Deistic. Consequently it is of importance to show that the principles from which Deism started were those of the Reformation. It is well to state at the outset that the movement has been much misunderstood. The Deists proper were constantly accused of holding views which they never held; conclusions were drawn from their premises which those premises did not warrant.[1] As a matter of fact they were little more than the Liberal theologians of the time. Anyhow they built on a foundation which strikingly resembled that of the Reformers. We propose to show a resemblance in the following features:

Socinian tendencies.
Private judgment in relation to the Scriptures.
Unorthodox attitude towards verbal inspiration.
Argument based on the Bible.
The habit of Bible study.

The Socinian features of Deism. The starting point of the Socinians was that the Christian religion was set forth in the New Testament, and that only that which was accessible to human reason should be treated as "matters of faith." Hence it should be easy to discover these principles in all the Christian denominations. Hence, moreover, as human reason was the supreme judge of truth, it followed that divergent opinions were entitled to respect.[2] The first attempt to reduce the fundamental articles of Christianity to the

[1] Overton, p. 76.

[2] Harnack, p. 121 (Vol. VII).

smallest possible number, in order to find some point of general agreement, was made by Aconcio in 1565.[1] *The Tractate on Schism* of John Hales, in 1636, was on the same lines. Chillingworth's *Judgment of the Religion of Protestants* (1637) desired a service which could be attended by all who believed in the Holy Scriptures.[2]

The father of the Deists was Herbert of Cherbury. In Paris he appears to have mixed with learned men weary of the strife between Huguenots and the Roman Catholics, who thought there must be some religious truth which would be acceptable to both sides. The Wars of Religion in France had created a public opinion which longed for some settlement. The widespread popularity of the *Satire Ménippée* (1594) was due to the fact that it voiced effectively the views of many. Montaigne used scepticism as an argument for suspending judgment.[3] Other writers had made contributions to toleration. All this may have influenced Lord Herbert.

There is, however, another point of view. The doctrine of Justification by Faith, in its sixteenth century form, contains difficulties which earnest kindly natures never entirely overcome. If faith is necessary for salvation, what about the heathen who have never heard the Gospel? Will they be condemned for not believing what they never knew? And what about the conscientious seeker after truth? Will he be condemned for rejecting what he cannot believe? What, moreover, is the true faith? Which is the right Church?

[1] See above, pp. 99, 100. [2] Ibid. [3] Lecky, Vol. II, p. 45.

The reasons which induced Herbert of Cherbury to produce his well-known *De Veritate* may well have been some such as these. In this work are set forth five propositions, the Notitiae Communae, which the author thought were known intuitively to everyone, and which might therefore be the foundation of a universal religion, universally known and universally believed.

Here, at the outset, we find resemblances to Socinianism, and may regard this desire for a universal religion as a characteristic of Deism. Before proceeding to elaborate this opinion, it will be convenient to point out in passing that Lord Herbert was a religious man and believed his *De Veritate* to have been divinely sanctioned. Here is his account of the special revelation he experienced. "As I knew it would meet with much opposition I did consider whether it was not better for me awhile to suppress it. Being thus doubtful in my chamber, one fair day in the summer, my casement being opened towards the south, the sun shining clear, and no wind stirring, I took my book *De Veritate* in my hand, and kneeling on my knees devoutly said these words, 'O Thou Eternal God, . . . I am not satisfied enough whether I shall publish this book, *De Veritate*. If it be for Thy glory, I beseech Thee give me some sign from Heaven; if not, I shall suppress it.' I had no sooner spoken these words than a loud though gentle noise came from the Heavens, for it was like nothing on earth." He took this as a sign and resolved to print his book.[1]

Hobbes, whose *Leviathan* produced a fermentation

[1] *Life of Lord Herbert*, p. 305.

in English thought not surpassed until the advent of Darwinism, appears to have been as impressed as Lord Herbert, from what he saw in France, that a religious settlement was an urgent necessity.[1] Instead of seeking it, though, in toleration, he sought it in the authority of the State.[1] This was very different from the *De Veritate*; but there is, in the *Leviathan*, one contribution to Deism, "the Unum Necessarium, the only article of faith which the Scripture maketh necessary to salvation, that Jesus is the Christ."[2] Here, I think, is an attempt to find a common basis, upon which all the sects of Christendom could unite.

Although much abused not only for Deism, but for atheism, Hobbes never intended to be anything but orthodox.[3] He always affirms that the mysteries of our religion are like pills. Swallowed whole they have the virtue to cure; but chewed are for the most part cast up again.[4] Though there are many things in God's Word above reason, yet there is nothing contrary to it.[5] Here, again, we see the religious tone of Deism.

This idea of a Unum Necessarium is the main thesis in Locke's *Reasonableness of Christianity*, which was an effort to find a creed which everybody could accept, and by which all men might be saved. It was based on the Bible, and is religious in spirit. His own account, too, shows that Locke had made

[1] D.N.B., p. 937.
[2] *Leviathan*, Part III, ch. 43, p. 479.
[3] Hunt, Vol. II, p. 384. *Leviathan. A Review*, p. 572.
[4] *Leviathan*, Part III, ch. 32.
[5] Ibid.

a habit of studying the Bible.[1] He tells us that at the beginning of the year in which his book was published, the controversy that made so much noise and heat amongst some of the dissenters coming one day accidentally into his mind, drew him by degrees into a stricter and more thorough enquiry into the question about Justification. The Scripture was direct and plain that was Faith that Justified. The next question then was what Faith that was which Justified. What it was which, if a man believed, should be imputed to him for righteousness. The right way to find this out seemed to be to search the Scriptures. Locke accordingly betook himself seriously to the reading of the New Testament. As he puts it, "What that produced, you and the world have seen."[2]

Toland's *Christianity not Mysterious* (1695) was also an effort to make religion more acceptable to ordinary people. It was an attempt to show that there is nothing in the Gospels contrary to reason or above it. The author took his stand upon the inspired Word of God. To him the question ought to be decided by the New Testament. "The Scriptures have engaged me in this error, if it be one."[3] His *Nazarenus* (1718) was intended to show that the Nazarenes were close to the spirit of genuine Christianity, and also distinctly Deistic. He also tried to show from the Koran that the Moslems were a sort of Christians, somewhat unitarian no doubt, but nevertheless paying homage to Christ. We are

[1] See also his *Commentaries on Galatians, etc.* Locke is not usually placed among the Deists.

[2] Locke, Preface to *Mr. Bold*, and pp. 480, 484.

[3] Toland, p. 88. Also pp. 14, 15, 24, 25, 8, 41.

still close to Herbert of Cherbury and his desire for a universal religion.

Shaftesbury, like all the above-mentioned Deists, was a diligent student of the Scriptures. It is recorded[1] that in his Bible there were observations in the margin of almost every chapter. His youthful essay, *An Enquiry Concerning Virtue*, was an attempt to base morality upon something other than revelation.[2] We may see here the beginning of a science of ethics.

Collins in his *Grounds of the Christian Religion* (1724), tried to put prophecy on a rational basis, so that it could be accepted by the average man. He argued for a figurative or allegorical interpretation, and professed to be defending Christianity. His *Discourse on Free-thinking* (1713) puts reason above revelation, but only in the sense that every man must be allowed to decide for himself whether a revelation is a revelation. He seems to have believed that Christianity, although unhistorical, was ideally true. This was a big step forward in the attempt to rationalise Christianity. It is the way of modernism and Liberal Protestantism.[3]

Woolston defended Collins until the orthodox gave up prophecy and took their stand on miracles. He then published his *Discourses on Miracles* (1727) to show the possibility of taking apparently miraculous incidents in a figurative or allegorical sense. We are still in the presence of efforts to make Christianity generally acceptable.

[1] Shaftesbury, Vol. III, pp. 209 and 315. Fowler, p. 38.
[2] Farrar, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 184.
[3] Collins, pp. xii and xiv. See also the headings of the chapters in Part I, "A Defence of the Old Testament against Mr. Whiston."

Morgan's *Moral Philosopher* was intended to dislodge the orthodox from their last stronghold. Forced by Collins to surrender the argument from prophecy; compelled by Woolston to relinquish the proof from miracles; driven by Shaftesbury to admit that morality might exist without revelation; they took their stand on the elevated moral teaching of the Gospel. Morgan assailed them by pointing out that doctrines like Vicarious Punishment were quite unsuitable for a universal religion.[1] In most other points he merely followed in the steps of Tindal, arguing that natural and revealed theology are one and the same,[2] that Jesus Christ was sent from God to restore, revive, and republish natural religion.[3]

Tindal's *Christianity as Old as the Creation* is the most important contribution, apart from Butler's *Analogy*, to the Deistic controversy.[4] It marks the culminating point.[5] It also has the merit of bringing out with great distinctness the essential position of the Deists.[6] God must have dealt equally with all men. Doctrines, therefore, not revealed to all cannot be imposed on all; for reason being the only faculty granted to all men must be sufficient to guide us all to truth. This seems to be the inevitable conclusion if one adopts the principle of Justification by Faith.[7]

It is surely unnecessary to elaborate further the

[1] Morgan, pp. 29, 30, and Preface to Vol. III.
[2] Ibid., Introd., p. 5.
[3] Ibid., Vol. I, p. 394.
[4] Storr, p. 51.
[5] D.N.B., Art., Tindal.
[6] Leslie Stephen, p. 135.
[7] Chubb's chief work corroborates this.

contention that Deism started from principles introduced by the Reformation. Deism was based on a Socinian basis.[1] The Bible is its standard of truth. Private judgement is everywhere upheld. Diligent study of the Scriptures was a characteristic.

Now it is worth while mentioning, since the Bible occupied so prominent a position, that but for the Reformation there would be no Bible. That is to say, that for all practical purposes, the Bible would be a sealed book. It is true that many Roman ecclesiastics profess no longer to discourage the reading of the Scriptures by their people of the Anglo-Saxon race; but observe what an important implication is here. What about Roman Catholics who are not Anglo-Saxons? Moreover, can there be any doubt that this preferential treatment of English-speaking Roman Catholics is a concession to public opinion?[2] I am not saying that the Roman Catholic policy is unwise. The argument is that the Bible is a book for specialists. To give a copy to an ignorant man is like giving a baby a bottle containing poison. "Poisonous pastures" is the way in which an Encyclical of Leo. XII refers to Bibles in the vernacular.[3] It is manifest by experience, says the 4th rule of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books, that if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be read everywhere more evil arises than good. Consequently it enacts that whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles,[4] or have

[1] See above, p. 69.
[2] Bagshaw, pp. 250, 251.
[3] Of May 3rd, 1824. *Cath. Ency.*, Art., Censorship, p. 524.
[4] Those translated by Catholic writers.

them in possession, without permission[1] shall not receive Absolution until they have given up their copies to the Ordinary.[2] The evidence could be extended *ad lib.* The Roman Church makes no secret of this.

There is just one more point in which Deism was, albeit unconsciously, carrying on the work of Luther. The Deists set loose to the doctrine of verbal inspiration. That is the modicum of truth in the allegation that they did not believe in revelation. The real attitude of both Luther and the Deists is difficult to determine. "They varied much in their attitude to the Bible. Some were content to argue their own ideas into Scripture, and those they disliked out of it"[3] When all is said and done, probably that was true of Luther also. It may, at least, be said with some truth that he found his authority "not in the letter of the Word of God; but in the self-authenticating witness of the Holy Spirit, speaking through its pages and discerned by the spiritual man."[4] His spiritual experience convinced him that we are Justified by Faith.[5] For the sake of this, his fundamental and essential doctrine, he called the Epistle of James "an epistle of straw."[6]

That is not all, however, Luther distinguished between the Word of God and Holy Scripture. He

[1] See *Cath. Ency.*, Art., Censorship. Still in force.
[2] The permission has to be in writing. Contrast the Greek Church, which circulates Bibles bought from the British and Foreign Bible Society.
[3] Hunt, Vol. III, p. 159. See also Overton, p. 76, and *Cam. Eng. Lit.*, IX, p. 295. Leslie Stephen, pp. 189 and 200.
[4] *Foundations*, p. 371.
[5] Lindsay, p. 435.
[6] Acton, p. 349.

refused to be dictated to even by apostolical authority. At times he took up an adverse line in regard to the infallibility of the Bible.[1] There are occasions, though, when Luther's position is perplexing. Probably it was the necessity of making a firm stand against the Anabaptists: perhaps it was his Catholic training; anyhow, there is a distinct tendency on occasion to attribute infallibility to the Bible.[2] Protestantism of course has followed *this*[1]; but in so doing has perhaps been untrue to itself. The Deists were merely working out that principle of religious individualism which was a large part of the inner significance of the Reformation from the first.[3]

By the time of the Deists (1690–1730), the days of persecution for the expression of opinion were practically over. In 1695, the Press Licensing Act of 1662 was allowed to drop, and from that time Deistic literature began to appear. Rationalism had been spreading before, but to what extent can be judged only from the denunciations that are to be found in orthodox works.[4] There were still, nevertheless, dangers of prosecution from three sources, even after 1695. The Ecclesiastical Courts had—and have—the power of imprisonment[5] for atheism, blasphemy, heresy and damnable opinions. The Common Law as interpreted by Lord Chief Justice Hale in 1676 could easily be put into force against

[1] *Foundations*, p. 371.
[2] Harnack, p. 246.
[3] I think this can be deduced without much difficulty. See *Foundations*, p. 371.
[4] E.g., Leland's *History of the Deistical Writers*.
[5] For a maximum term of six months.

sceptics, by wide interpretation of the word "blasphemy." The statute of 1698 enacts that for a second offence by writing, printing, teaching, or in any way denying the Christian religion to be true a person may be imprisoned for three years. The same statute provides evidence of the spread of unbelief, for it expressly states as its motive that "many persons have of late years openly avowed and published many blasphemous and impious opinions, etc."[1]

Most trials for blasphemy during the past two hundred years have come under the second of these three headings, but the statute of 1698 was very intimidating. It worried Sir Isaac Newton.[2] There were, moreover, certain prosecutions such as those of Woolston[3] and Annet.[4] Toland's early work was burnt by the common hangman:[5] so was one of Blunt's books.[6] On the other hand, Warburton wrote no more than the truth when he reminded the free-thinkers that there was a time, and that within your own memories, when such complaints were seasonable and useful; but happy for you, gentlemen, you have outlived it.[7]

When Voltaire landed in England in 1726, he was amazed at our freedom. To him, we appeared to be the disinterested guardians of the liberty of Europe.[8] The contrast with France must have been very

[1] Bury, p. 140.
[2] Hunt, Vol. II, p. 192.
[3] In 1729. See D.N.B., p. 439.
[4] In 1763. See D.N.B., p. 9.
[5] Toland, Preface, p. ix, pp. 9–12 and 19.
[6] Aubrey, 1679.
[7] Oman, p. 112.
[8] Lanson's *Voltaire*, p. 46. *Lettres Anglaises*, especially 6–10.

striking. There was no liberty of the press. Voltaire's own *Lettres Philosophiques* were burned by the public executioner: so was Rousseau's *Emile*. There was no liberty of conscience; for since 1685 Protestants were forbidden to meet for worship; and when discovered the pastor was condemned to death, and the congregation could be sent to the galleys.[1] By the *lettre de cachet* a person could be imprisoned without a trial, and might remain there—sometimes forgotten—for years.[2] Even government clerks could sell these documents blank; so that the purchaser could insert the name of anybody he liked.[3]

Is it any wonder that Voltaire idealised English life, the political and religious liberty, our limited monarchy, the equality in matters of taxation, the honourable place assigned to commerce? The noble constitution, the equality of every citizen in the eyes of the law, the right of every citizen to think what he pleased and to say what he thought, kindled in Voltaire not merely intellectual admiration, but true moral enthusiasm.[4] The example of England showed him that truth is not merely for the philosophers and a few men of the world. Henceforth, Voltaire felt himself called to destroy those superstitions by which his country was enslaved; and the result is known to all the world.[5]

Now what most engaged his attention in England was the controversy then raging between the

[1] Seignobos, p. 87.
[2] E.g. Latude remained in the Bastille for thirty-five years.
[3] Seignobos, p. 99.
[4] Churton Collins, p. 115.
[5] See Morley, *Voltaire*.

opponents and the apologists of Christianity.[1] The Deistic controversy was at its height. Collins' *Discourse on the Grounds of the Christian Religion* had appeared in 1724; and during the whole of Voltaire's residence in England the Press teemed with vindication replies, and rejoinders to Collins.[2] Woolston's *Discourses* appeared at the same time and had an enormous sale. The influence of all this upon Voltaire's determination to liberate his own countrymen[3] must have been considerable; for his contact with English society was mainly limited to the cultured and sceptical classes,[4] where Shaftesbury's ethical system had given birth to a Deism which would appeal to a cultured man without offending his intelligence.[3]

The work of Voltaire in securing freedom of thought in France is known to everyone.[5] His inspiration came from England. Two things that impressed him have a bearing upon our discussion. One, the way in which Deists were allowed to express themselves freely. The other, the way in which a multiplicity of sects, "each claiming to be the one authentic religion"[6] tended to promote toleration. "If there were one religion in England," he writes,[7] "its despotism would be terrible. If there were only two they would destroy each other. There are thirty, and they live in peace." Voltaire's influence after his return from England was enormous throughout the whole of Europe. Philosophers were soon the fashion in good society.[8] Voltaire

[1] Churton Collins, p. 143.
[2] Morley's *Voltaire*, p. 87.
[3] Condorcet.
[4] Ballantyne, p. 327.
[5] E.g., Morley.
[6] Tyrrell, p. 229.
[7] *Lettres Anglaises*.
[8] Seignobos, p. 94.

corresponded with Catherine of Russia, and Frederic the Great invited him to come and live at Potsdam. At the same time the people were enthusiastic. When Voltaire returned to Paris in 1778, the crowd carried him in triumph. Very soon all Europe was "imbued with philosophy." Applied by statesmen, it led to reform throughout Europe. Practised by the people themselves in France, it led to the French Revolution. Joseph II of Austria established religious toleration;[1] so did Frederic in Prussia.[2]

It does not seem an exaggeration to say that none of this would have happened but for the impression made upon Voltaire by his stay in England. And the impression would not have been made if England had not been a Protestant country. There would have been no picture of freedom to inspire anybody What Ruffini says of 1685 is equally true of 1726. The Catholic Party, over the question of toleration, is uncompromising now, and was even more so then.[3]

She *is* uncompromising. The Church condemns the idea that every man has a right to interpret the Scriptures. In Roman Catholic countries the reading of the Bible in the vernacular is restricted.[4] In England it is not so. The condition of the country makes it undesirable, and therefore in practice some discretion is allowed, "remembering always the principle on which restriction is founded."[5] Does this seem like compromise? If so, note the theory of persecution. "The Church would, therefore,

[1] Seignobos, pp. 73–78.
[2] "The friend of the great blasphemer Voltaire." Bury, p. 121.
[3] Ruffini, p. 189.
[4] See above, p. 94.
[5] Bagshawe, 237, 238.

seem to be strangely inconsistent; for while she claims toleration and liberty for herself, she has been, and still *remains*, intolerant of all other religions, and though the Church exercises her right of coercion, by spiritual sanctions, he has never relinquished the right to use other means." A distinction is made between pagans and Christians. The Church exercises her authority only over those whom she considers personally and formally apostate. The modern Protestant is not in the same category as the Albigenses. Moreover, she would not exercise her authority in the same way to-day. Her discipline is adapted to times and circumstances.[1] There is not much doubt, however, what the situation would have been, but for the Reformation.

What does Leo XIII say about liberty of conscience? He says that the phrase can have two meanings. It may signify liberty to follow in everything the wishes and commands of God, without hindrance from the State. The other kind of liberty rules out the observance of the divine precepts. The Pontiff approves of liberty in speech, writing and teaching; but only for the benefit of the truth. Thus liberty to worship must be conceded only to that religion which God Himself indicated and imposed as the true one.[2] The form in which the sentiment is expressed by Pope Leo is much milder than that of other pontiffs, but does not admit that all denominations may be placed on a perfect equality in the eyes of the law. Ruffini interprets the theory to mean that any toleration is an evil,

[1] *Cath. Ency.*, Art., Persecution, p. 703.
[2] *Encyclical*, November 1st, 1885 and June 20th, 1888.

and that the best State will be the one in which there is least toleration, and in which the greatest progress is made towards circumscribing it.[1]

(Advance in science depends even more upon the state of public opinion than upon the individuals in whose minds the new ideas first appear.[2] For instance, the religious prejudice against mutilating a dead body hampered medical science for a long time.) Dissectors had to be prepared for adventure, contrivance, and perseverance, like a traveller in the Spanish Main.[3] Vesalius on one occasion carried off, at the risk of his own life, the body of a criminal who had been hanged. (The trouble arose because of the popular belief in the resurrection of the body.) The Church, though not impervious to new influences, enforced belief on the ground of authority. Truth was not to be discovered by observation, by the individual reason, by advancing wherever the argument led the mind. Consequently, it was not until some time after the Reformation that there appeared "the full dawn of modern experiment."[4]

Now would things be any better to-day. The danger from the Church of Rome, in our time, is not the stake or the torture; but insidious moral and spiritual forces which threaten to stop the nations' progress, to corrupt the ethical standard, to darken the intellect.[5] There lies in Roman Catholicism a magic power. It is no slight inspiration to feel oneself a silent partner in this world dominion

[1] Ruffini, p. 48.
[2] Marvin, p. 195.
[3] Ibid., p. 202.
[4] Ibid., pp. 196, 197. See also above, pp. 22, 28.
[5] Nippold, p. 3.

Unfortunately religious needs and aspirations are exploited to further the political ends of the Papacy.[1] That is to say, the necessity that religion should be free and that the mind must be untrammelled is ignored. The Roman Index has become the highest authority over science wherever the power of the Papacy extends.[2]

This appears to be particularly so in history. The charges we are about to bring are very serious, and I do not wish to press them; but rather to suggest a line of thought which is very impressive, which is supported by an enormous amount of evidence, and which nothing in my own observation or limited experience has tended to mitigate. It is impossible to give any idea of the mass of evidence put forward by writers like Nippold, Coulton, and von Hasse. Here are just a few facts to give some slight indication of what we have in mind. It appears to be a principle with Roman Catholic writers that in historical research the interests of the Papacy are the ultimate criterion of truth.[3] Ecclesiastical history is considered to possess in dogma an unerring guide, and the interpretation of historical facts must lean closely and submissively upon it.[4] Infallible judgment on the Reformation, for example, is provided in the Bulls of Leo X. The historian has merely to follow these.

Mr. G. G. Coulton has done his best for many

[1] Nippold, pp. 224 and 226.
[2] Ibid., p. 236.
[3] Ibid., p. 238. Hefele's *History*, p. 237. Reinkens' *Falsification of French Catechisms*. Michaud's *Falsification of French Catechisms*.
[4] Pohle and Coulton, p. 241.

years to expose the lack of ingenuousness of Roman Catholic historians. His efforts have been ignored, his challenges disregarded, his most serious accusations undefended. I really think judgment might go by default. Here is an example of the sort of thing complained of. In the American translation of Alzog's *Church History*, the text has been deliberately falsified; or, as the editors put it, the translation, while scrupulously faithful, is not a slavish rendering, but a partial "improvement on the original." Mr. Coulton alleges that the difference is so great that the original and the translation might be mistaken for pamphlets on opposite sides.[1]

Again, the same author says, that in connection with the Roman Catholic Church and the Bible, Cardinal Gasquet has frequently reprinted quite indefensible mis-statements of fact, in spite of public exposure. For many years, too, he concealed his conviction that certain widely advertised statements in defence of his Church were inaccurate. Later on he publicly confessed this,—after the statements had been rendered untenable and ridiculous, through the work of non-Catholic critics. Dr. Hugh Pope, also, says Mr. Coulton, has shown astounding carelessness, ignorance, and lack of candour about the Wycliffe Bible.[2]

In Cardinal Gasquet's *Eve of the Reformation*, the absolute denial of any hostility on the part of the Church to the translated Bible is reiterated. As evidence, the Cardinal produces portions of Sir Thomas More's English works; but he suppresses "the many passages which contradict his thesis

[1] Coulton, p. 19. [2] Ibid., p. 26.

more plainly than these snippets seem to support it" The *Dialogue*, upon which Cardinal Gasquet chiefly relies, is "almost inaccessible to the public."[1]

These accusations are very serious and, as Mr. Coulton says, need equally serious documentary evidence to support them. Not only does he produce the evidence, but here, as always before, during the last sixteen years, he offers a further guarantee of good faith. Any one of the authors criticised, or any representative whom he will explicitly commission, is welcome to reply within reasonable limits to be arranged beforehand. Mr. Coulton then offers to print and publish the whole at his own expense.[2]

Lord Acton was a Roman Catholic; but even he says that after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve, a time came when the Catholics who long relied on force were compelled to appeal to public opinion. That which had been acknowledged and defended had to be ingeniously explained away. A swarm of facts was invented to meet the difficulty. The same motive which had justified the murder now prompted the lie. The lies have been repeated so often that they have been sometimes believed.[3]

On another occasion,[4] he said that Mr. Gladstone had been too hard on Ultramontanes, and too gentle with Ultramontanism, in alleging that the system promoted untruthfulness. That is not fair, said Lord Acton, for it not only promotes it, but inculcates mendacity and deceits. In certain cases it is made

[1] Coulton, p. 26.
[2] Ibid., p. 133. See also *The Truth about the Monasteries, etc.*
[3] Acton, p. 148.
[4] *Acton to Gladstone*, 1876 (Figgis and Lawrence, p. 43).

a duty to lie, but those who teach this do not become habitual liars.[1] It should be noted, by the way, that this was a very deliberate expression of opinion.[2]

When Cardinal Newman was consulted about founding a *Catholic Historic Review*, he said that unless they doctored all the facts they would be thought bad Catholics.[3]

What Newman and Acton alleged as an accusation, Cardinal Manning practically put forward as a doctrine. In connection with the difficulty of reconciling Roman claims with history, Manning declared[4] that the appeal from the living voice of the Church to any tribunal, even to that of history, is an act of private judgment, and of treason. "Scholars outside the Catholic Church cannot rightly handle history."[5]

Bishop Gore will not be suspected of being "a bigoted Protestant"; but even he has stated that the Papal supremacy has been bought at a great price. Not only has the doctrine tended, especially since the Reformation, to a narrowness; but also to schism.[6] This was true, I think, in connection with the Greek Church. It was certainly so with the Old Catholics.

[1] *Anglican Essays*, p. 109.

[2] Figgis and Lawrence, Introd. p. 55. See Herbert Paul, *Letters to Mary Gladstone.*

[3] *Anglican Essays*, p. 109.

[4] *Daily Telegraph*, October 8th, 1875. *Anglican Essays*, p. 121, note 2.

[5] The Very Reverend Hugh Pope, *Dublin Review*, January, 1921, p. 70. Quoted in *Anglican Essays*, p. 121.

[6] Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 203. Denny's *Papalism* is, says Dr. Gore, on the whole, fairly unanswerable. Our other strongest book is Father Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.*

In propagating the theory, demands are made upon history which cannot be verified. Hence the maintenance of Papal supremacy involves "a constant perversion of truth."[1]

This, says Bishop Gore, is an awful charge; but it has been pressed home by two of the most learned of modern historians, themselves shining lights of the Roman Church,—Von Döllinger and Acton. The former was excommunicated: the latter died in the communion of Rome, but he did not mince his words in charging with treason to the truth the maintainers of the Roman claims.[1]

As one reads the record of forged documents and misquotations used to support papal claims, it seems an inevitable conclusion that an assertion of authority which has needed so much falsehood to support it in the past, and still needs so much distortion of fact, cannot be wholly of God.[1]

Some of the greatest modern Roman Catholics have confessed that the official pleas for their Church have too often been founded on palpable falsehood.[2] We have to face the possibility,—according to Bishop Gore, "the certainty,"[3]—that Ultramontane writers will always be found manipulating facts and making out a case.[4] They do more. As soon as the moment appears favourable and no new edition is to be feared, unpleasant books are

[1] Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 203. Denny's *Papalism* is, says Dr. Gore, on the whole, fairly unanswerable. Our other strongest book is Father Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*.

[2] *Anglican Essays*, p. 126.

[3] *Catholic Claims*, p. 97.

[4] *Anglican Essays*, p. 123.

bought up. For years it has been impossible to obtain a copy of the works of Gratry and of Maret against Papal Infallibility. Janus[1] is also disappearing.[2]

It is not difficult to see how history would have fared if there had been no Reformation. Nor need one suppose that the physical sciences would have been any better off. Astronomy would have made little progress; for the Ptolemaic system remains to this day embedded in Christian tradition, like a spent bullet lodged in the flesh.[3] As for Geology, even with the Reformation the fight has been hard enough.[4] What a rancorous controversy there was over the first chapter of Genesis. People can still remember, too, what a battle was waged for biology by Huxley and the other protagonists of evolution. Even theology would have been hampered. As it is, the doctrine of verbal inspiration has been a serious obstacle.

[1] I.e., Döllinger.
[2] Nippold, pp. 239, 240.
[3] Hibbert, p. 492, April, 1925.
[4] Bonney, p. 197.

IV
The Future

IV

Separation of Morality from Religion.

THE defence that would often be put forward for views like this would be to point to the disruptive effect of the Reformation. Truth has a slow reaction upon behaviour. Is not then the dissemination of a false religion as wrong as advertising deleterious foods?[1] Hence the principle of private judgment in religion may be a deadly error.

In support of this it would be alleged, and with good reason, that since the power of Rome ceased to dominate Europe that excessive other-worldliness so prominent in mediaeval Catholicism has disappeared. In its place has grown up a purely ethical Christianity, in which the Kingdom of Heaven is but a way of referring to the moral evolution of humanity on this earth.[2]

Before proceeding it may be as well to refer to one or two possible objections. First of all, "was it not the scepticism which produced the Reformation, rather than the Reformation which created the scepticism?" To some extent this is true. Scepticism was, no doubt, one of the conditions which combined to produce the Reformation; but had there been no Reformation there very soon would have been very little scepticism. It is the spread of toleration which has made free-thought safe.

[1] Tyrrell, p. 228. [2] Ibid., p. 70.

Nor must it be supposed that rationalists have always been on the side of liberty. Impressed by sectarian animosities, Hobbes was convinced that the remedy was the entire subordination of the ecclesiastical to the secular.[1] The religious intolerance displayed by the irreligious leaders of the French Revolution is, according to Ruffini, unique in history. Here, for the first time, appeared the intolerance of disbelief and negation. They obtained their theory, though, from some of the English Deists,[2] and from French rationalists, for instance, Rousseau.[3] If we project on to the dark background of the Paris of the period the first half-dozen modern priest-haters we know, it will be possible to understand the intolerance of the irreligious.[3]

Occasionally it has been argued that the fight for freedom has been a victory for science, not religion. Galileo and Copernicus are mentioned. The handicap to geology and biology that has resulted from the infallible Bible is urged. This Infallible Bible argument is very common nowadays; but it is evident that if the growth of unbelief is the result of the Reformation, the restrictive influence exerted by the theory of verbal inspiration cannot have been very considerable. Both points of view contain some truth; but in thinking of one it is necessary to bear in mind the other.[4] The erection of the Scriptures into an infallible authority was not an end; but only a means of pulling down the vast superstructure of dogma which was obstructing

[1] D.N.B., Art., Hobbes, p. 937.
[2] Ruffini, p. 347. See Acton, p. 199.
[3] Ibid., pp. 347, 375, 383, 387.
[4] Harnack, p. 244.

the advance of civilisation.[1] When man is trusted without limit; when he professes to draw his knowledge from esoteric sources; the whole weight of his authority is lent to the obstruction of truth and the multiplication of error.[2] Which of the sciences has not been persecuted[3] and opposed tooth-and-nail by the exploiters of religion?[4]

To resume. The Reformation *has* had a disturbing effect upon the mind of Europe. The question at issue is whether the results have been detrimental.

Let us take theology first. The beginnings of biblical criticism made by Luther and others were afterwards neglected; for Protestants were quite satisfied to base their faith upon the Bible. In a sense, the first impulse towards the higher criticism came from "heretics," like Hobbes and Spinoza; but Peter Simon, a priest of the Oratory, questioned the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and suggested that the first Gospel was not the work of Matthew; and a Roman Catholic physician, Astruc, first put forward the theory of J. and E.[5] Protestants, however, did their share. Le Clerc not only criticised the Pentateuch, but conjected that the synoptic writers had all used the same source; while the great Arminian, Grotius, advocated the theory that Mark was an abridgement of Matthew, and that Luke used Matthew and Mark.

The crisis in England did not come until the appearance of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860. Since

[1] Crozier, p. 29. See above, pp. 87, 95, 96, 117, 118.
[2] Tyrrell, p. 244.
[3] Ibid., p. 279.
[4] Ibid., p. 280.
[5] In 1753.

then there have been great changes in theology. The Atonement has been displaced from its central position, and the emphasis placed upon the Incarnation.[1] The Incarnation, moreover, has been subjected to drastic criticism[2]; while doctrines like Eternal Punishment and the Resurrection Body are now kept in the background.

There is a growing tendency to begin from within, from the Christ of experience, and to emphasise the validity of the religious consciousness. This point of view is often traced to Schleiermacher, but people have suggested that the importance attached by Luther to the assurance of salvation by faith, gave prominence to the religious experience of the individual, and tends to give reality to the subjective. It has even been said that Luther provided the basis for the Experimental Method.[3]

In philosophy, especially in psychology, the process of disintegration has been, perhaps, even more pronounced. It began with Descartes and his search for "the seat of the soul."[4] Although he and his successors believed that the soul was an independent entity,[5] their work gradually undermined the old conception of the relation between mind and body. Locke continued the process of disintegration by showing how we obtain our knowledge of the world around us. The objects of knowledge, he

[1] *Foundations*, p. 269. Storr, pp. 3, 4.

[2] See Schweitzer, *passim*, especially p. 396. Also J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought*, ch. 21, especially section 2.

[3] M'Cheyne Edgar, pp. 65, 66. See also *Cath. Ency.*, Art., Reformation.

[4] Situated, according to some, in the pineal gland.

[5] See McDougal, p. 99.

says, are ideas.[1] Berkeley, as everybody knows, went a step further, and concluded that there is no objective reality except ideas.[2] Hume advanced to what was almost an *impasse*, asserting that the external objects which we represent as having an existence independent of our perception is nothing but a cluster of perceptions so closely combined by constantly happening together that the mind is led to interpret the subjective connection as a mode of objective being.[3] The self has no real existence. What really corresponds to the unity and identity of the self is the ease and rapidity with which the train of past perceptions is revived. The only objective fact is the constant conjunction of certain impressions and ideas in the mind.[4]

Kant and Hegel and the others endeavoured to persuade us to retrace our steps, but Hegelianism is still strong, in spite of the New Realism.[5]

Even Lotze, who declares that "finite centres of moral and spiritual activity must somehow be saved,"[6] does not seem to have advanced beyond the Hegelian position that all that was necessary was that spirit should be there in some form, and should be differentiated into finite spirits.[7] There is no evidence for immortality.[8]

In the same way, Bosanquet holds that souls are made to be destroyed and then re-made.[9] A soul

[1] Webb, *The Intellectualism of Locke*.
[2] Adamson, p. 5.
[3] Hume, pp. 496, 497.
[4] Ibid., *Human Nature*, pp. 1, 4, 6.
[5] E.g., McTaggart, Bradley, Bosanquet.
[6] *Microcosmus*, Vol. III, p. 389.
[7] McTaggart, *Hegelian Cosmology*, p. 25.
[8] Ibid., p. 44.
[9] Webb, p. 1.

re-made is one born again, and setting its heart on, perhaps even realising, the same values.[1] Bradley, too, would have us believe that the human self is not ultimately real. It belongs to the realm of appearance only.[2] Bosanquet has said much the same, in asserting that all finite centres of experience are finally dissolved in the absolute.[1] "To neither Bosanquet nor Bradley does the evidence of a future life appear strong, still less convincing."[1] Prof. C. C. J. Webb admits, although he is an idealist, that the soul *may* exist apart from the body. He appears, however, to believe in pre-existence. Hence his position would correspond to MacTaggart's, which claims to demonstrate the immortality of the "self," as a consequence of an idealist system.[3]

It would not do to expatiate on this subject, although elaboration would be easy; for we have other things to consider. It will, perhaps, be sufficient to leave this matter with the remark that even William James in his essay, *Does Consciousness Exist?* answers with a negative; and that McDougall himself makes immortality hinge upon an "if" and a "might."[4]

Consequently all sorts of people read the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*. They, too, ask, "What is life?" And they, likewise, answer, "One moment in annihilation's waste." So the Ideal of Life and Conduct becomes a determination to

> Make the most of what we yet may spend,
> Before we too into the dust descend.

[1] Webb, pp. 251, 252.
[2] Ibid., p. 1.
[3] McTaggart, *Hegelian Cosmology*, pp. 77, 83, 99.
[4] McDougall, p. 372. See also Appendix H.

It is difficult, of course, to say how far such a point of view is influencing the ordinary man. This disintegrating element is not working alone, however. Into the social and political thought of the time has filtered the belief that the time-honoured doctrine Might is Right has a scientific foundation. There is a feeling that biology, especially "Darwinism," has given its verdict in favour of violence, and against social justice. It is maintained by some that this is the most far-reaching cause of the "fiery new faith that the human lot can be made level by new economics."[1] Anyhow, it seems true that "eagerness to grasp a full share of the good things of the present life has been intensified by the decline of that religious faith which held out to the unfortunate in this world the hope of indemnity in another."[2]

I think we may go further, and admit that multitudes are saying in their hearts, "If to-morrow we die, and death is the end: let us eat and drink. If we have not the wherewithal, let us see if we cannot take from those who have."[1] If men are taught to scoff at the existence of God, the immortality of the human soul, and the doctrine of a future state; if, in a word, they are led to believe that their sole object in this world is to obtain pleasure and ease, it is not surprising if many men rebel against their lot.[3]

The *Apocalyptic Vision of Jesus* is a Gospel for the poor, who have ceased to place their hope in the

[1] Morley's *Miscellanies*, p. 316. Goldwin Smith, *Essays on Questions of the Day*, p. 1.
[2] Goldwin Smith, p. 1.
[3] MacCaffrey, *Nineteenth Century*, p. 500.

present life, and for those who no longer possess the hope of salvation by progress. It is by faith that man walks in the light of eternity, and sees earth and its burdens as from a distant climate,—a speck in immensity: and yet labours for the alleviation of men's sorrows, as they can never labour who require the assurance of success.[1]

Have we lost this ideal? To me, it is not without significance that in the famous *Golden Treasury* there is towards the end, that is to say, amongst the poets of more recent days, very striking indications that they had lost their moorings. When Matthew Arnold considers the course of the life of mortal men on the earth, he sees that:

> Most men eddy about,
> Here and there: eat and drink,
> Chatter and love and hate,
> Gather and squander: are raised
> Aloft: are hurled in the dust;
> Striving blindly: achieving nothing.

He sees us like a sailor with anguished face and flying hair, in a storm:

> Still bent to make some port,—he knows not where;
> Still standing for some false, impossible shore.[2]

Swinburne, in the same way, thanks whatever gods there be:

> That no life lives for ever;
> That dead men rise up never;
> That even the weariest river
> Winds somewhere safe to sea;

So that at last there is

> Only the sleep eternal
> In an eternal night.[3]

[1] Tyrrell, p. 163. [2] Rugby Chapel. [3] The Garden of Proserpine.

It seems only too true that for many, nowadays,

> Beyond this place of wrath and tears
> Looms but the horror of the shade.[1]

The war has left throughout Europe a despair which cries aloud for a new religion, a force able to give men energy to live. In a sense it may be true that all revolutions are economic revolutions; but the mightiest dangers have come from religious and moral changes in men's hearts.[2] Soviet Russia has supplied the new religion.[3] The world of Labour appears to be permeated with a spirit of almost aimless insurrection. There seems to be a drift towards lawlessness. Very dangerous, too, is the scepticism of so many working-men. The work of Karl Marx was based on materialism; and under the influence of Marx the whole of our social system is now being subjected to a pitiless scrutiny, by our new and more educated type of artisan.[4]

We seem to be in the midst of a new individualism, for which the individual with his momentary whims, passions, and impulses is the sole measure of moral values. Objective moral values are no longer recognised as they used to be. There is a cheap and easy materialism abroad which produces a confusion, a weakening, even a total loss of spiritual conviction.[5] Now, unless a man's ethical aims and motives are to suffer paralysis, he must believe that the good which is supreme over the human interests

[1] W. E. Henley. See also Storr, p. 380. See also A. H. Clough, perhaps "the most representative poet of his time."
[2] Morley, p. 303.
[3] Russell, *The Theory and Practice of Bolshevism*.
[4] Wells, pp. 515–517.
[5] Leighton, pp. 40–43.

and motives is nearest akin to the ruling power of the universe. To believe this is to be religious; for religion is the faith that the highest values should, and must, rule in the human order, and be supreme in the cosmic order.[1]

If you take a number of decent citizens, you will be inclined to think that if brought together anywhere they would continue to behave as before. Bring them, however, to some remote mining-camp; and observe what follows. Very soon they will pursue the trail of retaliation and revenge like the earliest barbarians,—or the ruffians of the cinema. The return, moreover, will be as slow and laborious as the descent was swift. To eradicate the vices of decades will take years.

Herbert Spencer, in *The Data of Ethics*, presents very attractively the theory that humanity is becoming more humane, and that Altruism will increase. At the end of that captivating passage, headed Conciliation,[2] he looks forward to the time when Christianity, or rather, "a rationalised version of its ethical principles, will eventually be acted upon."[3] It may be so. There is something enthralling about Mr. Spencer's presentation of the subject; and it is not easy to escape his fascination. The time, however, is not yet. Civilisation is still artificial. Not a stone in its vast temple but was fashioned and brought to its place by the blood and sweat of generations. Customs, habits, codes of honour have been beaten into mankind by war, by

[1] Leighton, pp. 126, 127. And see ch. 30.
[2] Ch. 14.
[3] Spencer, p. 222.

fear, by persecution, by torture, by superstition, by organised power crushing in its weight and infinite in its ramifications.[1]

Liberty and toleration are no longer axiomatic, as they were before the war. The democratic movement and the reactionary have renewed their contest, not only in domestic politics, but throughout Europe. Bolshevism, the rule of the majority, has ended in a tyranny. Italy is governed by the Fascisti. In Spain, General Primo de Rivera has established the Directory. In England there is probably a growing sympathy with the "die-hard" point of view, which advocates the repression of its more violent political opponents. Socialism, moreover, is tending to become syndicalism and to put its confidence, not in political agitation, but in "direct action." In its most vigorous form, also, socialism no longer aims at expressing the desires of the Proletariat; but has become the Minority Movement.

In short, there is a widespread feeling that the question of toleration is a problem to be reviewed. The solution must be sought anew. People are beginning to wonder whether the ideals of political freedom were not among the errors of the "stupid nineteenth century."[2]

Some are even going further, and are asking whether the whole intellectual development of Europe since the Reformation has not been a mistake. It was from the Reformation that there came that bold freedom of enquiry, that revolt against authority, which threatens to make freedom nothing, and faith nothing; so that freedom will

[1] Crozier, p. 29. [2] *Review of Reviews*, April-May, 1925.

ultimately be swallowed up in the abyss of anarchy.[1] In the great work, which is its imperishable glory, the work of destroying pagan idolatry, vice, impurity, and brute force not a plank of Catholic theology was superfluous.[2] Was it then an error to have undermined the Papal supremacy? Ought we, as some would have us believe, to attempt to return to the Middle Ages and to the Mediaeval Church?

No type of religion, say some, is so successful as the Roman in providing a steadfast and tranquil background for the spiritual life.[3] The peremptory idea of authority, backed by its effective regimental discipline, is best for the needs of the plain man.[4] There is, moreover, no certainty, say many, except in the Church of Rome.

It is, however, not necessary to think meanly or to speak bitterly of the Church of Rome in order to believe that the extension of its influence in England would be unfavourable to the best interests of the nation. Rome is rendering, and is destined to render, notable services to mankind; but the restoration of its ancient supremacy in this country would be a grave spiritual disaster. The Roman version of Christianity is inadequate for modern needs. Its incapacity for reform disqualifies it for the spiritual leadership of free and civilised peoples. To-day it retains its hold mainly over the most backward communities,—Irish, French-Canadians, Southern Italians,—and over the most unlettered sections of the greater peoples. Even this is done only by lowering its standard of faith and morals

[1] Oman, p. 5.
[2] Crozier, p. 29.
[3] Gore, p. 185.
[4] Ibid., p. 225. See above, p. 80.

until they are clearly inferior to the best of the non-Christian world.[1]

The Church which declares its formularies incapable of re-interpretation, and like the laws of the Medes and Persians, cannot hope to escape the fate of that great Empire.[2] No Church in which this right of restatement is impossible can continue to be a leader of mankind. In such a community, there can be neither spiritual nor intellectual growth. Its membership will include mainly the traditionalists, the reactionary and the obscurantists,—in fact, the intellectual and moral "minors of the race."[3]

But may not the Roman Church improve? The present position is that in an ocean of error and forgery there appears only one rock, the chair of Peter; only one sure note, the infallibility of the successor of Peter. The Pope can promulgate a new dogma. In 1854, he did; although one of his predecessors had declared, in speaking of the Immaculate Conception, that the eternal wisdom had not yet disclosed the depths of this mystery.[4] Much therefore which the eternal wisdom will reveal to the Popes who are to come may still lie hidden in the womb of the future. Already, with scarcely a word, our generation has accepted what in any other age "would have called into the lists an armed Europe."[5]

Will the constitution of 1870 become a new starting point, will there perhaps develop a living Christianity of the congregational order? Will

[1] Henson. p. 27.
[2] Charles, p. 170.
[3] Ibid., p. 164.
[4] Harnack, p. 85.
[5] Ibid., p. 110.

the Pope himself perhaps renounce his fictitious divine dignity? Will there evolve from the Heart-of-Jesus Worship, and from the living devotion of believers, a new faith?[1]

"Foolish hopes," says Harnack. The signs of the times point in a different direction.[1] Those whose interests are vested in the existing system and its worst corruptions will never open their arms to science. Is it likely that the Roman bureaucracy, that exploits even the Papacy, will ever resign its revenue and its ascendancy? What tyranny ever willingly admitted a truth fatal to its own advantage?[2]

We may be hastening towards one of those extremities which are God's opportunities. The tide of truth may sweep away the barriers of ignorance.[1] Indeed it has been said that the head of the Roman Church has already felt the influence of the spirit which is abroad.[3] Roman Catholics in America, also, are increasing by probably nearly a hundred thousand a year, and the great majority of the priests are now American born. The Roman Catholic Church in America is growing.[4] And will go on growing. This is a fact of considerable importance; for the spirit of intolerance is dying out among the Romanists in America.[5] Consequently Baron von Hügel may be right in saying that the day will come when Rome shall again unite the whole of Christendom. As he says, however, this will not be until what is true in Protestant instincts, even more

[1] Harnack, p. 113.
[2] Tyrrell, p. 279. Fairbairn, pp. 203, 204.
[3] Schaffe, p. 14.
[4] *Church Times*, June 5th, 1925, p. 667.
[5] Ruffini, p. 54.

than in Protestant objections, have been satisfied.[1] As for us, all we would say is that should this day ever dawn the happy consummation would have to be included among the Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct.

Probably the truth is that, although Rome will continue to flourish for many a long day, the future is not for her. Rome must perish. There is, nevertheless, some reason to suppose that Catholicism will endure. Even an "anti-Catholic" writer admits that in the Episcopal Church of America forty per cent. of the clergy are Catholic, and that in five years the proportion will be sixty per cent., "unless something is done."[2] The increase of the Anglo-Catholics in England is known to everyone, and has been described by one Protestant thinker as "of deep sociological importance."[3]

To me, it is equally significant that the Evangelical Party is moving in the same direction In the Church of England, for example, where the tendency a century ago was towards Puritanism, to-day even people who would not object to being considered "Low Church" acquiesce without difficulty in things which would at one time have been regarded with dislike. Nobody now objects to the clergy wearing surplices. They did once. How many people nowadays bother about the "eastward position"? Notice the change in the attitude towards Eucharistic doctrine. The *Catholic Encyclopaedia* has enumerated more than a few similar

[1] Von Hügel, p. 276.
[2] *Church Times*, May 1st, 1925. Rev. Alexander Cummins, Secretary of the National Church League.
[3] Schaffe, p. 14.

phenomena.[1] In fact, nobody who pauses to think is likely to doubt that the English Church as a whole has, since the days of Pusey, become less and less Puritan.

There are signs, moreover, of a similar movement amongst the Free Churches. Even Congregationalists, the old Independents, are beginning to develop a centralised organisation. It would be an exaggeration to say that the Free Churches are evolving a system of Episcopacy, but the growing demand for moderators is, at least, significant. Liturgical services are growing in popularity. Dr. Orchard, some years ago, founded a League of Free Catholics.[2]

These things may be merely straws, and they may not indicate the presence of a particularly strong breeze; but there is another point of view which tends to justify the suspicion that the swing of the pendulum is towards Catholicism. It is purely negative, but is worth mentioning. As a spiritual force, Protestantism on the Continent is quite ineffective in opposing Rome.[3] There is no force in the liberal theology which tells us that eternal life is moral life, and the Kingdom of Heaven the eventual triumph of social reform.[4]

As far back as 1899, it was possible for a protagonist of Protestantism to feel that the chief enemy was not political Catholicism (Ultramontanism), although that never ceases to be a danger.

[1] *Cath. Ency.*, Art., Reformation.
[2] The movement has not been very successful.
[3] Von Hügel, p. 190.
[4] Tyrrell, p. 163. See below, p. 150. Ditchfield, *The Church in France*, p. 478. See also H. E. Noyes, *The Church of Spain and of Portugal.*

The peril was, even then, recognised to be Catholicism as a religion and an ecclesiastical spirit. What threatened was clericalism, ritualism, the alluring union of exalted piety and solemn secularity: the substitution of obedience for religion.[1] The progressive "Catholicising of the Protestant Churches" in Germany had already begun.[2] Since then a similar process, "essentially destructive of Anglican pre-suppositions," has succeeded to a remarkable extent in shaping the Church of England to its own purpose. In a few years this party may be dominant in the Lower House of Convocation. Its object, in the opinion of many, is union with Rome.[3]

It is not always true to regard Anglo-Catholics as people who will ultimately "go over to Rome," but it does seem fair to regard the Mass and the Confessional as the essential features of Anglo-Catholic, as well as of Roman, Christianity. Now this form of religion is often thought to create a devout, but dependent type of Christian, emotional rather than intelligent, easily roused to enthusiasm, but ill-fitted for responsible citizenship.[4]

Personally, I am not prepared to commit myself without reserve to such generalisations, but am content to mention them and pass on. A more important consideration is that we appear to be on the brink of a moral struggle between the secular and the religious interpretation of human nature and of human duty, in face of which the Anglo-Catholic

[1] Harnack, *Thoughts on the Present Position of Protestantism*, p. 8.
[2] Ibid., p. 32.
[3] Henson, p. xvi.
[4] Ibid., p. xxviii.

is as confident as he is helpless. He uses a language unintelligible outside his own circle. He discloses "a mentality" which makes mutual understanding impossible.[1] Catholic creeds and conciliar definitions are to the Catholic the nearest approximation to absolute proof which finite minds are capable of apprehending.[2] The remoteness from any apprehension of the modern situation is revealed by the futility of their affirmations. Anglo-Catholicism is no satisfactory alternative to Anglicanism. Its success in the work of destruction may be not inconsiderable; but it cannot replace Anglicanism in the heart of English laymen.[1] English religion is Protestant to the core.[3]

On the other hand, as we said above, the tendency in England to-day is away from the puritanism of mid-Victorian days. Hence the problem is complicated. The conflict between secular and religious ideals is by no means finished; and the responsibility for the conflict may be laid upon Protestantism; for the Roman Church would have stamped out incipient rationalism before there had arisen, as there has, a spirit of the age too strong to be suppressed. The problem therefore with which we are now concerned is whether the Effect of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct has provided an antidote; for it is admitted that the poison of infidelity came from the revolt against the Papacy. Now it seems clear that the Papacy will not be our salvation in the future. Where, then, is our remedy to be sought?

[1] Henson, p. xxxviii. He quotes the *Report of the First Anglo-Catholic Congress*, 1920, e.g., on p. 64.
[2] Henson, p. 64.
[3] Ibid., p. xxxix.

In Anglo-Catholicism? I think not, for the reasons just given. In liberal Protestantism? Who shall say? Father Tyrrell assures us that its identification of the Kingdom of Heaven with moral progress means that "the gourd whose leaves have so long shaded mankind from the sickening heat of the desert is withered."[1]

It must, nevertheless, be borne in mind that between Roman Catholicism and liberal Protestantism there is more than one stopping place. I believe that the people of our time are passing from rather blind belief in dogmatic teaching to a demand for some freer, more individual, spiritual life.[2] There comes a stage in the inner life of the spirit when the individual is bound, in the name of intellectual honesty, to question, and, if necessary, deny the validity of tradition and inherited dogma.[3] It may well be that many men are, to-day, experiencing a spiritual upheaval, almost against their will. Quite likely the progress of modern science will in the end bring men to a more secure religious belief;[2] but the religion of personal conviction and of conscience, a conviction which is based on history but which does not petrify history into dogma, is the form of religion adapted to modern individualistic tendencies.[4]

No civilisation has ever existed without a religion; and it is generally admitted that Western Civilisation cannot afford to reject the spiritual values of

[1] Tyrrell, p. 163. Burkitt, p. 15 and *passim*.
[2] Hugh Walpole, *Daily Express*, September, 1925.
[3] *Foundations*, p. 375.
[4] Burkitt, p. 203.

Jesus.[1] In the New Testament we may observe the high water-mark of ethical and religious insight so far. Hence there is little doubt that for us it must be some form of Christianity or nothing. Even those outside the Church feel the truth of this.[2] We have said enough above to show that humanity cannot dispense with religion.[3] Man's spiritual and moral growth leads him straight to a pessimism which only religion can cure. See, for example, what has happened to "the grey wisdom of the world-weary East."[4]

Now given that man still requires a religion: what religion is likely to persist? I think we may safely say that Western civilisation is irrevocably wedded to Christianity, and that the future lies with Western civilisation. It even seems likely that the future is in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon races.

Much of this may seem to many little more than conjecture. There are, nevertheless, at least two lines of thought which support these opinions.

First, there is the thesis elaborated by Benjamin Kidd in his *Principles of Western Civilisation*, based on his earlier work, *Social Evolution*. Briefly stated, his view is that survival depends not only upon adaptation to the environment of the moment, but upon another factor. It is not the race which is best fitted to survive to-day which will necessarily survive in the future. Survival depends upon being adapted

[1] Leighton, p. 5.
[2] E.g., Arnold Bennett, *Daily Express*, September, 1925, and Hugh Walpole, *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1889, "The Future of Agnoticism."
[3] Pp. 140–143 above. Bouquet, p. viii.
[4] Tyrrell, p. 163.

to the needs of the future. To be adjusted to our present environment is not enough. We must be fitting ourselves for the circumstances with which we will have to contend in the days to come. How is this to be done? Benjamin Kidd claims to show us how it is being done. In a word, according to him, it is being done by impulses based on supernatural sanctions.

Secondly, science has moved a long way from the old materialistic outlook. Hints at purpose and design come to us from zoology. Prof. Parks believes that the study of geology leads to a belief in Theism.[1] Our conception of matter, too, is such that the antithesis between the material and the spiritual is not what it was.[2]

There is room between Lutheranism and Ultramontanism for another path of Christian life; and the leaders of Gallicanism strove to find and keep it; but it was impossible within the Roman communion.[3] At the Reformation the policy of the Church of England was to keep the mean between the two extremes of too much stiffness in refusing and of too much easiness in admitting changes.[4] An attempt was made to combine continuity and progress.[5] Now to-day an organisation which steadfastly holds the middle path is of inestimable value to mankind. Never before has the value of this mediating position been such an important factor,[6] not only

[1] Presidential address at the British Association, 1925.
[2] Bonney, pp. 27 and 95.
[3] Von Hügel, pp. 32, 33. See Appendix K.
[4] The Preface to the Book of Common Prayer.
[5] B. H. Streeter, p. 10.
[6] Burkitt, pp. 21–33, in *Anglican Liberalism*.

in national development, but in the universal progress of humanity;[1] for it is not so much a compromise, as an endeavour to do justice to conflicting ideals.[2]

In so many modern religious bodies there is either obscurantism or a break with the spiritual continuity of Christianity. In the Church of England religion can grow.[3] The Church continues to live, and to advance along the Via Media. Whither it will lead one cannot say, but we believe that as we proceed the way will open before us.[4] Perhaps I may be forgiven for maintaining that so far as the future is concerned, one of the most important Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct was the ideal enshrined in the comprehensive Via Media of the Anglican Church.

[1] Nippold, p. 265.
[2] *Anglican Liberalism*, p. 33.
[3] Bethune-Baker, p. 14.
[4] Burkitt, p. 34, in *Anglican Liberalism*. See also Burkitt, p. 27 and *passim*.

Conclusion.

WE have now seen some of the effects of the break-up of the wonderful mediaeval union of Church and State, religion and morality.

Among the first came the law of liberty, by which religion was made possible outside the Church.

Side by side with this arose the idea of the supremacy of the State. The State became supreme in its own territory, even over the Church. Later, with the growth of toleration, Churches were permitted to exist free, to a great extent, from the control of the State.

This has meant religion outside the Church and independent of the State. As early as the eighteenth century morality was being established on natural rather than on religious foundations.[1]

Finally, with the end of the Victorian period came an age of "individualism" in which morality was divorced from religion, in practice as well as in theory. There has also grown up a tendency to separate morality from the State; for so I interpret the aspirations of the minority movement. At least, the ethical code of the communist takes no heed of the State until *it* has become supreme. Then, as in Bolshevism, religion *is* the service of the State.

Is this the end? We venture to think it is not. Mussolini, and others, have already begun to re-establish the old ideal, that a man's first duty is not

[1] By men like Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, etc.

to himself, but to the nation. This is the old ideal of the Romans, of Machiavelli, of Hobbes, of Nietzsche.

In religion, too, there are indications of a revived interest on the part of the ordinary man. It would seem as if people are beginning to find themselves in the condition of the Hindu in the story. Brahma found him, one day, in a paroxysm of despair, because existence with his wife had become intolerable. Brahma, taking compassion on him, carried off the cause of his distress. But very long after the Hindu made his way to the abode of Brahma and besought him with much clamour to give him back his wife. Said Brahma, "But you cannot live with her." "Woe is me," replied the Hindu, "I cannot live with her,—and cannot live without her."

So it seems to be with man. He cannot accept the religion which is at present being offered him; and yet he cannot live without religion. Is, then, Christianity the final religion? Prof. Gwatkin is reported to have said[1] that the present position is like a wrestling match in which Christianity, the stronger of the two wrestlers, has loosened his hold, but only to get a new and more powerful grip.

But which kind of Christianity? Liberal Protestantism in the opinion of many has failed.[2] It would be a mistake to underrate the vitality of the evangelical faith, but Catholicism appears to be making headway. Probably, however, its future

[1] Quoted by A. C. Bouquet, *Is Christianity the Final Religion?* p. viii.

[2] See, e.g., F. C. Burkitt in *The Failure of Liberal Christianity*, p. 15.

will depend upon its power to assimilate its environment, to combine and co-ordinate aspiration and history, instinct and science.[1] Modernism, I believe, has come to stay.

Our conclusion is that, no matter what form of Christianity prevails, the Anglican Church is sufficiently flexible and comprehensive to assimilate the new truth. For here we have a Church to whom, in the words of the Prayer Book, "Christ's Gospel is not a ceremonial law, but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit."[2]

[1] Burkitt, p. 27.
[2] The Preface: "Of Ceremonies."

to himself, but to the nation. This is the old ideal of the Romans, of Machiavelli, of Hobbes, of Nietzsche.

In religion, too, there are indications of a revived interest on the part of the ordinary man. It would seem as if people are beginning to find themselves in the condition of the Hindu in the story. Brahma found him, one day, in a paroxysm of despair, because existence with his wife had become intolerable. Brahma, taking compassion on him, carried off the cause of his distress. But very long after the Hindu made his way to the abode of Brahma and besought him with much clamour to give him back his wife. Said Brahma, "But you cannot live with her." "Woe is me," replied the Hindu, "I cannot live with her,—and cannot live without her."

So it seems to be with man. He cannot accept the religion which is at present being offered him; and yet he cannot live without religion. Is, then, Christianity the final religion? Prof. Gwatkin is reported to have said[1] that the present position is like a wrestling match in which Christianity, the stronger of the two wrestlers, has loosened his hold, but only to get a new and more powerful grip.

But which kind of Christianity? Liberal Protestantism in the opinion of many has failed.[2] It would be a mistake to underrate the vitality of the evangelical faith, but Catholicism appears to be making headway. Probably, however, its future

[1] Quoted by A. C. Bouquet, *Is Christianity the Final Religion?* p. viii.

[2] See, e.g., F. C. Burkitt in *The Failure of Liberal Christianity*, p. 15.

will depend upon its power to assimilate its environment, to combine and co-ordinate aspiration and history, instinct and science.[1] Modernism, I believe, has come to stay.

Our conclusion is that, no matter what form of Christianity prevails, the Anglican Church is sufficiently flexible and comprehensive to assimilate the new truth. For here we have a Church to whom, in the words of the Prayer Book, "Christ's Gospel is not a ceremonial law, but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit."[2]

[1] Burkitt, p. 27.
[2] The Preface: "Of Ceremonies."

Bibliography.

The works quoted are referred to by an abbreviation, as follows :

Author.	*Title.*	*Referred to as*
Acton (Lord)	*History of Freedom and other Essays.* 1907.	Acton.
Adamson (R.)	*Developments of Modern Philosophy.* 1903.	Adamson.
	Anglican Essays. 1923.	
	Anglican Liberalism. 1923.	
Allen (P. S.)	*The Epistles of Erasmus.* 1918.	Erasmus.
Aubrey (J.)	*Brief Lives.* 1898	Aubrey.
Bacon (L. W.)	*A History of American Christianity.* 1899.	Bacon.
Ballantyne (A.)	*Voltaire in England.* 1893.	Ballantyne.
Barry (W.)	*The Papacy in Modern Times.* *H.U.L.	Barry.
Beard (C.)	*Lectures on the Reformation.* 1883.	Beard.
Benians (S.)	*Renaissance to Revolution.* 1923.	Benians.
Bergson (H.)	*Creative Evolution.* 1907.	Bergson.
Bethune-Baker (J. F.)	*The Faith of the Apostles' Creed.* 1918.	Bethune-Baker.
Blount (C.)	*Works.* 1693.	Blount.
Bolingbroke (Lord)	*Works.* 1754.	Bolingbroke.
Bonney (T. G.)	*The Present Relations of Science and Religion.* 1913.	Bonney.
Bosanquet (B.)	*Life and Finite Individuality.* 1913.	Bosanquet.
Bouquet (A. C.)	*Is Christianity the Final Religion ?* 1921.	Bouquet.
Boutroux (E.)	*Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy* (tr. by J. Nield). 1909.	Boutroux.
Bradley (F. H.)	*Appearance and Reality.* 1917.	Bradley.
Burkitt (F. C.)	*Failure of Liberal Christianity.* 1910	Burkitt.
Bury (J. B.)	*History of Freedom of Thought.* H.U.L.	Bury.
Butler (J.)	*The Analogy of Religion.* 1736.	Butler.
—	*The Cambridge Modern History.*	Cam. His.
Carr (H. Willdon)	*The Scientific Approach to Philosophy.* 1924.	Willdon Carr.
Carter (E. H.)	*The New Past.* 1925.	Carter.
—	*The Catholic Encyclopaedia.* 1922.	Cath. Ency.

*H.U.L. stands for Home University Library.

Author.	*Title.*	*Referred to as*
Charles (R. H.)	*Between the Old and New Testaments.* H.U.L.	Charles.
Chesterton (G. K.)	*The Superstitions of the Sceptic.* 1925.	G.K.C.
Chubb (T.)	*Works.* 1738.	Chubb.
Collins (A.)	*Works.* 1713.	Collins.
Collins (Churton)	*Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau in England.* 1908.	Churton Collins.
Condercet.	*Vie de Voltaire.* 1787.	Condorcet.
Cooper (A. A.)	*Works.* 1773.	Shaftesbury.
Coulton (G. C.)	*Anglican Essays.* 1923.	
Coulton (G. C.)	*The Roman Catholic Church and the Bible.* 1921.	Coulton.
Coulton (G.C.)	*The Truth about the Monasteries.* 1923.	
Creighton (M.)	*A History of the Papacy.* 1897.	Creighton.
Crozier (J. B.)	*History of Intellectual Development.* 1901.	Crozier.
Cruttwell (C. T.)	*Six Lectures on the Oxford Movement.* 1899.	Cruttwell.
Currie (M. A.)	*Luther's Letters.*	Luther.
Dearden (H. W.)	*Modern Romanism Examined.* 1899	Dearden.
Denny (E.)	*Papal Claims.* 1912.	Denny.
Descartes (R.)	*Meditations.*	Descartes.
—	*Dictionary of National Biography.*	D.N.B.
Ditchfield (P. H.)	*The National Churches.*	Ditchfield.
Döllinger (J. J. I. von)	*Re-union of the Churches.* 1872.	Döllinger.
—	*Encyclopaedia Brittanica.*	E.B.
Fairbairn (A. M.)	*Catholicism, Roman and Anglican.* 1879.	Fairbairn.
Farrar (A. S.)	*A Critical History of Free Thought.* 1862.	Farrar.
Frassinetti (J.)	*The New Parish Priest's Practical Manual.* 1883.	Frassinetti.
Froude (J. A.)	*Short Studies on Great Subjects.* (Collins).	Froude.
Gardner (P.)	*Evolution in Christian Ethics.* 1918.	Gardner.
Gasquet (F. A.)	*The Eve of the Reformation.* 1900.	Gasquet.
Gore (C.)	*Epistle to the Romans.* 1899.	Gore.
Gore (C.)	*Roman Catholic Claims.*	
Gore (C.)	*The Holy Spirit and the Church.* 1924.	
Grisar (H.)	*Luther* (tr. by E. M. Lamond). 1913	Grisar.
Haldane (R. B.)	*The Pathway to Reality.* 1904.	Haldane.
Haldane (R. B.)	*The Reign of Relativity.* 1921.	
Hallam (A.)	*Constitutional History of England.*	Hallam.

Author.	*Title.*	*Referred to as*
Harnack (A.)	*History of Dogma* (tr. by W. M'Gillchrist), Vol. VII. 1899.	Harnack.
Harnack (A.)	*The Constitution and Law of the Church* (tr. by F. L. Pogson). 1910.	
Harnack (A.)	*Monasticism and the Confessions of of St. Augustine* (tr. by E. E. Kellett). 1901.	
Hasse (K. von)	*A Handbook to the Controversies with Rome.* Vol. II. (tr. by A. W. Sterne). 1906.	Hasse.
—	*Hastings Encyclopaedia Biblica.*	Hastings.
Henson (H. H.)	*Anglicanism.* 1921.	Henson.
—	*Life of Edward Lord Herbert by Himself,* ed. by H. Walpole. 1826.	Herbert.
Hobbes (T.)	*Leviathan.* 1881.	Hobbes.
Hügel (F. Baron von)	*Philosophy of Religion.* 1921.	Hügel.
Huizinga (J.)	*Erasmus* (tr. by F. Hoppman). 1924.	Huizinga.
Hunt (J.)	*Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* 1896.	Hunt.
Hume (D.)	*Enquiry concerning Human Understanding.* 1748.	Hume.
Hume (D.)	*Works.* 1854.	
Illingworth (J. R.)	*Personality, Human and Divine.* 1913.	Illingworth.
James (W.)	*Oxford Lectures.* 1911.	James.
Janssen (J.)	*L'Allemagne et la Reforme* (tr. by M. G. A. Heinrich). 1887.	Janssen.
Joad (C. E. M.)	*Introduction to Modern Philosophy.* 1924.	Joad.
Kidd (B.)	*Principles of Western Civilisation.* 1908.	Kidd.
Lanson (G.)	*Voltaire.* 1906.	Lanson
Lea (H. C.)	*A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences.* 1896.	Lea.
Lea (H. C.)	*History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.* 1907	
Lecky (W. E. H.)	*A History of the Rise of Rationalism.* 1865.	Lecky.
Leighton (J. A.)	*Religion and the Mind of To-day.* 1924.	Leighton.
Lindsay (T. M.)	*History of the Reformation,* Vol. I. 1906.	Lindsay.
Locke (J.)	*Works.* 1714.	Locke.
MacCaffrey (J.)	*A History of the Catholic Church from the Renaissance to the French Revolution,* Vol. II. 1915.	MacCaffrey.

Author.	*Title.*	*Referred to as*
MacCaffrey (J.)	*A History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. II. 1909.	
Macaulay (T. B.)	*Essay on Milton.*	
Macaulay (T. B.)	*Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes.* (Dent).	Macaulay.
M'Cheyne Edgar (R.)	*The Genius of Protestantism.* 1900.	M'Cheyne Edgar.
McDougall (W.)	*Body and Mind.* 1911.	McDougall.
McTaggart (J. E.)	*Immortality and Pre-existence (Hegelian Cosmology)*, Ch. 4. 1918.	
—	*The Manual of Indulgences.** 1878.	—
Morgan (T.)	*The Moral Philosophers.* 1737.	Morgan.
Morley (J.)	*Miscellanies.* 1908.	
Morley (J.)	*Voltaire.* 1886.	Morley.
Murray (R. H.)	*Erasmus and Luther.* 1920.	Murray.
Nippold (F.)	*The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century* (tr. by L. H. Schwab). 1900.	Nippold.
Oman (J.)	*The Church and the Divine Order.* 1911.	Oman.
Oman (J.)	*The Problem of Faith and Freedom, etc.* 1906.	
O'Reilly (E. J.)	*The Relations of the Church to Society* 1892.	O'Reilly.
Overton (J. H.)	*The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.* 1887.	Overton.
Paul (H.)	*Life of J. A. Froude.* 1905.	Paul.
Paul (H.)	*Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone.* 1913.	
Pennington (A. R.)	*The Church in Italy.* 1893.	—
Pollard (A. F.)	*Henry VIII.* 1905.	Pollard.
Pullan (L.)	*Religion since the Reformation.* 1923	Pullan.
Rashdall (Hastings)	*Conscience and Christ.* 1916.	Rashdall.
Robertson (J. M.)	*A Short History of Freedom of Thought.* 1915.	Robertson.
Robinson (C. H.)	*History of Christian Missions.* 1915.	Robinson.
Robinson (C. H.)	*The Missionary Prospect.* 1915.	
Ruffini (F.)	*Religious Liberty.* 1912.	Ruffini.
Russell (Bertrand)	*The Analysis of Mind.* 1921.	Russell.
Russell (Bertrand)	*Theory and Practice of Bolshevism.* 1918.	
Ryder (A. R.)	*The Priesthood of the Laity.* 1911.	Ryder.

* The Manual of Indulgences, being a collection of Prayer and Good Works to which the Sovereign Pontiffs have attached Holy Indulgences. (Published by Order of His Holiness Pope Pius IX.)

Author.	*Title.*	*Referred to as*
Schaffe (P.)	*History of the Christian Church.* 1888.	Schaffe.
Schweitzer (A.)	*The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (tr. by W. Montgomery). 1911.	Schweitzer.
Seignobos (C.)	*History of Contemporary Civilisation.* 1919.	Seignobos.
Seignobos (C.)	*History of Mediaeval Civilisation.* 1907.	Seignobos (Mediaeval).
Spencer (H.)	*Data of Ethics.* 1907.	Spencer.
Stawell (F. M.) and Marvin (F. S.)	*The Making of the Western Mind.* 1923.	Marvin.
Stephen (Leslie)	*History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century.* 1881.	Leslie Stephen.
Storr (V. F.)	*Development of English Theology.* 1913.	Storr.
Streeter (B. H.)	*Foundations.* 1912.	Streeter.
Streeter (B. H.)	*Restatement and Reunion.* 1914.	Streeter, B. H.
Thureau-Dangin (P.)	*The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century* (Vol. I). 1914.	Thureau-Dangin.
Tindal (M.)	*Works.* 1732.	Tindal.
Toland (J. J.)	*Works.* 1702.	Toland.
Turberville (A. S.)	*Mediaeval Heresy and the Inquisition.* 1920.	Turberville.
Troëltsch (E.)	*Protestantism and Progress* (tr. by W. Montgomery). 1912.	Troëltsch.
Tyrrell (G.)	*Christianity at the Cross-roads.* 1909	Tyrrell.
Vaughan (H. C.)	*The Catholic Church from Within.* 1901.	Vaughan.
Voltaire	*Works.* (Beuchot).	Voltaire.
Ward (J.)	*Naturalism and Agnosticism,* Vol. I. 1898.	Ward.
Warnack (G.)	*Outline of a History of Protestant Missions* (ed. by G. Robson). 1906.	Warnack.
Waterworth (J.)	*The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Ecumenical Council of Trent.** 1848.	Waterworth.
Webb (C. C. J.)	*The Destiny and Value of the Individual.* 1919.	Webb.

*Based on Pallavicino.

Index.

Absolution 10, 58, 62
Accommodation 42, 45
Aconcio 100, 101, 110
Acton 127, 129
Address to the German Nobility 87
Adolphus, Gustavus 34
Advent 44
Aguecheek, Sir Andrew 21
Albingenses 123
Alzog 126
Anabaptists 99, 101, 118
Analogy (Butler's) 107
Anglican absolution 58
Anglican confession 58, 63
Anglican confirmation 57
Anglican establishment 82
Anglicanism 150, 154, 157
Anglo-Catholics 76, 147, 149, 151
Annates 93
Annet 119
Antinomianism 15, 17
Anti-trinitarians 98
Apocalyptic Vision 139
Apocrypha 35
Apostolic Succession 51
Arminianism 18, 99, 106, 135
Arnold 19, 140
Asceticism 71
Astruc 135
Atonement 136
Augsburg Confession 34

Bartholomew's Day 97, 127
Baptists 41, 57, 101, 102
Bayle 109
Benefit of Clergy 90
Berkeley 137
Beza 100
Bible and Deists 108
Bible and Peasants' War 32
Bible and Persecution 134
Bible and Reformation 116, 134
Bible and Roman Church 122, 126
Bible (Infallible) 35, 108
Blasphemy 118
Blount 119
Bolshevism 141, 143, 155
Bosanquet 137
Bradley 138
Brownists 101
Buddhism 77
Burns 73
Butler 107

Calvin 100
Calvinism 18, 56, 69, 97, 103, and see Puritan
Carthusians 6
Castellion 99
Catechism (Arminian) 100
Catechism (Racovian) 100
Catechism (Socinian) 100
Catherine of Russia 122
Catholic Ency. 30, 33, 56, 77, 147
Catholic Historic Review 128
Catholics, Free 148
Celibacy 16
Channing 41
Charlemagne 89
Charles II 107
Charles V 30, 33
Chaucer 90
Chesterton 20, 70
Chillingworth 101
Christianity as Old as the Creation 115
Christianity not Mysterious 113
Christianity, Reasonableness of 112
Church 50, 64, 82, 88, 93, 104
Churches (Free) 79, 106
Clarendon Code 102
Clericis Laicos 93
Collins 108, 114, 121

Conciliation (Spencer's) 142
Confession 10, 41, 56, 60, 97, 149
Confirmation 41, 56
Congregationalists 101, 102, 104, 148
Consubstantiation 55
Copernicus 134
Correspondence (Erasmus) 6, 7, 15
Correspondence (Luther) 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 98
Coulton 20, 125
Councils, General 5, 6, 7, 13, 37, 61
Counter Reformation (Doctrine) 9, 34–40, 51, 54, 59
Counter Reformation (Education) 23
Counter Reformation (Missions) 42
Counter Reformation (Morals) 22
Counter Reformation (Persecution) 29
Cromwell 101–105
Crozier 19
Curia 6, 7, 14, 35, 38

Data of Ethics 142
"Darwinism" 139
Deism 79, 108–116, 121
Deists 79, 108–117, 121, 134
Descartes 136
Dialogue (More's) 127
Dickens 19
Directory 143
Discourse on Freethinking 114
Discourse on the Grounds of the Christian Religion 114, 121
Discourse on Miracles 114, 121
Disintegration 77–9, 107–9, 133, 140
Disruption (Schism) 77–9, 143
Dissolution of Monasteries 26
Döllinger 3, 15, 68, 129

Economic Effects 95
Education 24–28
Eisteddfods 69
Emile 120
Encyclopaedists 81
Enquiry Concerning Virtue 114
Erasmus 6, 9, 15, 25
Erastianism 81–83
Essays and Reviews 135
Esprit des Lois 108
Eucharist 54, 56, 59, 147
Evangelicals 57, 99, 147
Eve of the Reformation 26, 126

Family 65
Fascisti 143
Francis, S. 70
Francke 50
Frederick the Great 122
Froude 73

Galileo 134
Gasquet 26, 29, 126
Geneva 75
Germany 5
Gibbon 108
Gladstone 127
Golden Treasury 140
Gore 128
Grace, Doctrine of 44
Gratry 130
Grisar 8, 16
Grotius 135

Hale 118
Hales 101
Hallam 103
Harnack 56, 146
Harrington 105
Hase, von 125
Hegel 137
Henry II 88, 90
Henry III 93
Henry IV 88
Herbert of Cherbury 108, 110
Heresies 29, 77, 97
Higher Criticism 135
Hinduism 77, 156
History and Roman Church 125
Hobbes 111, 134, 156
Hood 19
Hooker 75

Hügel, von 146
Huguenots 33, 97
Humanism 98
Hume 108, 137

Idealism 138
Imitatio Christi 66
Immaculate Conception 37, 145
Immortality 137
Incarnation 136
Indemnity Acts 108
Independents 101, 102, 104, 148
Index 30, 116, 125
Indulgences 7, 37, 41, 59
Infidelity 77, 79, 107, 133, 140–, 150
Inquisition 29, 62, 78, 100
Intercession of Saints, 41
Invocation of Saints 60
Islam 76, 77, 113

Jacquerie 31
James, 138
Jansenists 70, 76
Janus 130
Jesuits 23, 42, 45, 62, 70, 76, 104
Jonson, 20
Joseph II 122
Judgment of the Religion of Protestants 101
Justification by Faith 3, 11, 30, 53–57, 96, 110, 115

Kempis, Thomas à 66, 67
Kant 137
Kidd 152
Koran 113

Lateran Council 6, 38
Latimer 10
Lea 61
Lecky 103, 106
LeClerc 135
Lessius 104
Lettres Philosophiques 120
Leviathan 111
Liguori 62
Lilburne 105
Locke 104, 108, 112, 136
Lotze 137
Louis XIV 79
Luther and Anabaptists 118
Luther and Antinomians 14, 15, 17
Luther and Church 50, 87, 93
Luther and Deists 117
Luther and Faith 3–5, 99
Luther and Indulgences 4, 12
Luther and Inspiration 117
Luther and Mass 55
Luther and Missions 44
Luther and Peasants' War 31
Luther and Religious Experience 3, 136
Luther and Toleration 97
Luther and Wesley 50
Lutherans 56, 58, 103, 153

Macaulay 18, 72
Machiavelli 156
MacTaggart 138
Malvolio 21
Mandeville 108
Manning 128
Maret 130
Marriage 65
Marx 141
Mass 51, 60, 70, 149
Masses 41
McDougall 138
Melancthon 15, 25
Methodists 49, 57
Middleton 108
Milton 104
Missions 42, 45, 49
Modernism 157
Molina 104
Monasticism 16, 67, 70
Montaigne 110
Montesquieu 108
Moral Philosopher, The 115
Morals 5, 14, 22
Moravians 49
More 126
Morgan 108, 114
Morone 100

National Churches 82
Nazarenus 113
Netherlands 29
Newman 128
Newton 119
Nietzsche 156
Nippold 125
Nonconformists 79, 106

Occasional Conformity 108
Ochino 100
Offida 70
Omar 138
Ordination 51, 56, 58
Oxford Movement, The 91

Papacy 9, 78, 146, 150
Parks 153
Pascal 41
Peasants' War 31
Pecca Fortiter 16
Penance 41
Persecution 29, 118–121, 134
Peter's Pence 93
Philip II 30
Pietism 50
Poor Law 68
Pope, Hugh 126
Popes 5, 7, 23, 24, 30, 88, 95, 116, 123, 125
Preceptor Germaniae 26
Prague 43
Predestination 19
Pre-Raphaelites 91
Presbyterians 101, 104
Presence, Real 56
Priesthood of Believers 50–55, 59, 63, 71, 93, 105
Primo de Rivera 143
Principles of Western civilisation 152
Probabilism 62
Protestants 43, 51, 54–58, 60, 65, 67, 97–99, 148, 150
Provisors 93
Purgatory 10, 59
Puritan 19, 21, 22, 68, 70, 72, 148, 150

Rakau 100
Realism, New 137
Reformers 14, 24, 42, 44, 96
Renaissance 4, 6, 64, 79
Resurrection of the body 124, 136
Re-union 75
Revolution, French 79
Richelieu 34
Romanticism 91
Rousseau 104, 120, 134
Ruffini 122, 123, 134

Sacraments 4, 53, 58
Satire Ménippé 110
Schism 75–9, 143
Schism Act 108
Sects 97
Schleiermacher 136
Secularisation of the Church 36
Seignobos 56
Servetus 98
Shaftesbury 108, 114, 121
Simon, Peter 135
Social Evolution 152
Socinianism 99, 102, 103, 106, 109
Socinus 99, (Sozzini) 100
Soul 137
Spencer 142
Spinoza 135
State and Church 87
Streeter 75
Suarez 104
Swinburne 140

Table-Talk 16
Tauler 41
Tetzel 8, 12
Tindal 108, 115
Toland 108, 113, 119
Toleration 96–105, 120, 134, 143
Toleration Act 102, 106
Tractate on Schism 101
Transubstantiation 55
Trent, Council of 9, 34, 36, 39, 41, 51, 54, 59

Troëltsch 74
Twelfth Night 21, 68
Twelve Articles 32
Tyrrell 76, 151

Ultramontane 127, 148, 153
Unction, Extreme 41, 58

Veritate, De 111
Vesalius 124
Via media 154
Village Gods, etc. 77
Voltaire 108, 119
Vulgate 35

Walpole 108
Warburton 119
Wars, Religious 33
Webb 138
Weber 74
Wesley 41, 49
Westphalia 34
Whitefield 50
Whitehead 77
William III 105
Wiseman 45
Woolston 108, 114, 119, 121
Worms, Diet of 87, Concordat of 93

Xavier 42

Zinzendorf 49
Zwingli 8, 56, 99



PRINTED BY
W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.,
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

M
3558-6

BV
630
.C5

Chapliss
The effects of the
Reformation

808643

APR 6 1964 Bindery--reg.

2- 8326

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
48 433 629
2-
HARPER STORAGE
BV 630
.C5
HARPER STORAGE
SWIFT LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
48 433 629